CCSD

CCDS

NATIONAL OPINION POLLS ON SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

JUNE 1987 AND MARCH 1988

CANADIAN COUNCIL ON SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

CONSEIL CANADIEN DE DÉVELOPPEMENT SOCIAL

THE CANADIAN COUNCIL ON SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

Founded in 1920, the Canadian Council on Social Development (CCSD) is an independent, national, non-profit organization. Through research, policy analysis, community consultation and information sharing, the CCSD provides a forum for citizen participation in the formulation of progressive social policies.

The CCSD is the only national organization whose mandate and involvement embrace all aspects of social development and social policy. Since its beginning, the Council has been actively involved in the evaluation of existing programs, the identification of essential improvements, and the promotion of needed developments. It has been a positive, non-partisan advocate of social measures such as universal inoculation, pensions, unemployment assistance, worker's compensation, medicare, legal aid, daycare, and social and cooperative housing. The Council played an active role in the development of the Canada Assistance Plan and the Child Tax Credit, and has been a promoter of the Guaranteed Annual Income concept, self-help, voluntarism and community economic development.

The CCSD is not a "think tank". It **is** the only national social research, advocacy and policy organization with an open public membership. CCSD's analyses, opinions, research and information reflect not only highly professional technical work but also the active analysis and shared experience of its broadly representative membership.

The Council's diverse membership includes concerned individuals as well as representatives from business, labour, government, public and private service organizations, voluntary associations and institutions. An annual meeting of the membership reviews the year's program and financial activities. Council activities are directed by a voluntary, 39-member Board of Governors. Board members are formally elected at the annual meeting for terms of one, two and three years.

The CCSD is a major publisher in the field of social development. Publications include books, research reports, policy briefs and occasional papers, as well as four bilingual periodical publications: **Perception**, Canada's social development magazine; and three quarterly national newsletters — **Overview**, reviewing current developments in social policies and programs; **Initiative**, serving the self-help community; and **Vis-à-vis**, exploring family violence issues.

National headquarters of the Canadian Council on Social Development are located at 55 Parkdale Avenue, Ottawa, Ontario, K1Y 4G1. Tel: (613) 728-1865. CCSD also has a Quebec office, located at 515 Viger Ave., Suite 410, Montréal, H2L 2P1. Tel: (514) 288-1687. Membership information is provided on the inside back cover.

LE CONSEIL CANADIEN DE DÉVELOPPEMENT SOCIAL

Fondé en 1920, le CCDS est un organisme national indépendant à but non lucratif. Le Conseil encourage les citoyens à participer à l'élaboration de politiques sociales progressistes par des recherches indépendantes, des analyses de politiques, des consultations communautaires et la diffusion d'information.

Le CCDS est le seul organisme national dont le mandat et le secteur d'activités recouvrent tous les aspects du développement et de la politique à caractère social. Depuis ses débuts, le Conseil participe activement à l'évaluation des programmes actuels, à l'identification des améliorations nécessaires et à la promotion des solutions indispensables. Il s'est fait le porte-parole positif et non partisan de mesures sociales telles que les vaccins universels, les pensions, l'aide aux chômeurs, l'indemnisation des accidentés du travail, l'assurance-santé, l'aide juridique, les garderies, ainsi que le logement social et coopératif. Le Conseil a participé activement à l'élaboration du Régime d'assistance publique du Canada et du crédit d'impôt pour enfants; il a de plus appuyé les concepts du revenu annuel garanti, de l'entraide, du bénévolat et du développement des ressources communautaires.

Le CCDS est le seul organisme national de recherche, de politiques sociales et de représentation qui recrute ses membres parmi le public. L'information, les analyses, opinions et recherches produites par le Conseil découlent non seulement d'un travail technique hautement professionnel mais aussi de la réflexion et de l'expérience de membres qui représentent tous les intérêts promus par le Conseil.

Le CCDS compte des personnes intéressées et des représentants d'entreprises, de syndicats, de gouvernements, d'établissements, d'associations bénévoles, ainsi que d'organismes publics et privés offrant des services. Les membres du Conseil se réunissent chaque année afin d'examiner le programme et les activités financières du CCDS. Un bureau des gouverneurs composé de 39 membres bénévoles dirige les activités du Conseil. Les gouverneurs sont élus officiellement lors de la réunion annuelle pour un mandat d'un, deux ou trois ans.

Principal éditeur dans le secteur du développement social, le CCDS publie notamment des livres, des comptes rendus de recherches, des mémoires de politiques, des documents de réflexion, de même que quatre périodiques bilingues: **Perception**, magazine canadien sur le développement social; et trois bulletins nationaux trimestriels: **Perspectives**, sur l'actualité sociale nationale; **Initiative**, sur les groupes d'entraide et **Vis-à-vis**, sur la violence familiale.

Le siège social du Conseil canadien de Développement social est situé au 55, avenue Parkdale, Ottawa (Ontario) K1Y 4G1. Tél: (613) 728-1865. Le CCDS a aussi un bureau du Québec à Montréal, situé au 515, avenue Viger est, Bureau 410, Montréal, H2L 2P1. Tél: (514) 288-1687. On trouvera des détails complémentaires sur l'adhésion au dos de la couverture arrière.

NATIONAL OPINION POLLS ON SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

JUNE 1987 AND MARCH 1988

by Harry MacKay, Ph.D.

and participants in
Social Information Exchange Training Project II & III

Sponsored by
The Canadian Council on Social Development
August 1988

CONTENTS

TABLES 3

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS
by Harry MacKay, Poll Director 7

FOREWORD
by Terrance M. Hunsley, Executive Director 9

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 11

I. INTRODUCTION 13

II. METHODOLOGY 14

III. DESIGN OF THE SAMPLE 15

IV. SUMMARY OF PRINCIPAL FINDINGS 18

V. DETAILED FINDINGS

EMPLOYMENT 22

INCOME SECURITY 48

SOCIAL SERVICES 61

VI. APPENDICES

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE JUNE 1987 77

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE MARCH 1988 85

TABLES

TABLE 1:	SAMPLE BY REGION	15
TABLE 2:	SAMPLE BY STRATUM	16
TABLE 3:	SAMPLE BY AGE AND SEX	16
TABLE 4:	MOST IMPORTANT PROBLEM THAT CANADIANS FACE	23
TABLE 5:	WAYS TO FIGHT UNEMPLOYMENT -- FROM MOST TO LEAST FAVOURABLE	25
TABLE 6:	GOVERNMENTS ARE DOING ENOUGH TO FIGHT UNEMPLOYMENT?	26
TABLE 7:	FIGHTING UNEMPLOYMENT -- Responses by Region	27
TABLE 8:	WHAT IS THE BEST WAY TO CREATE JOBS?	28
TABLE 9:	COMMERCIAL JOB CREATION?	29
TABLE 10:	NON-PROFIT JOB CREATION?	29
TABLE 11:	CREATING JOBS IN NON-PROFIT ORGS -- Responses by Region	30
TABLE 12:	JOB CREATION AT HOME?	31
TABLE 13:	JOB CREATION AWAY FROM HOME?	31
TABLE 14:	CREATE JOBS LOCALLY -- Responses by Region	31
TABLE 15:	MOVE UNEMPLOYED -- Responses by Region	32
TABLE 16:	GUARANTEE JOB TRAINING?	33
TABLE 17:	GUARANTEE A JOB?	33
TABLE 18:	JOB GUARANTEE, BY LANGUAGE & SEX	34
TABLE 19:	GUARANTEE OF JOB TRAINING -- Responses by Region	35
TABLE 20:	PROVIDE WORK EXPERIENCE FOR UNEMPLOYED YOUTH?	36
TABLE 21:	JOB CREATION THROUGH WAGE SUBSIDIES TO EMPLOYERS?	36

TABLE 22: LOWER INTEREST RATES TO CREATE JOBS? 37

TABLE 23: LUMP SUM UIB TO CREATE JOBS? 38

TABLE 24: PRO-RATE BENEFITS FOR PART-TIMERS? 38

TABLE 25: MORE, SAME, OR FEWER HOURS? 39

TABLE 26: LESS WORK TIME WITH CUT IN PAY? 40

TABLE 27: TAKE CUT IN PAY -- Responses by Level of Income 41

TABLE 28: MORE OR FEWER IMMIGRANTS? 41

TABLE 29: FIRST PRIORITY FOR IMMIGRATION POLICY 42

TABLE 30: IMMIGRATION -- Responses by Region 42

TABLE 31: IMMIGRATION POLICY -- Responses by Region 43

TABLE 32: NEED JOB TRAINING IN FUTURE? 44

TABLE 33: IMPORTANCE OF SCHOOLING/TRAINING 45

TABLE 34: FREE TRADE WILL IMPROVE JOB PROSPECTS? 46

TABLE 35: HIGHER THAN THE PROVINCIAL MINIMUM WAGE 47

TABLE 36: OPINIONS ON INCOME SECURITY -- FROM MOST TO LEAST FAVOURABLE 48

TABLE 37: SUPPLEMENT WAGES OF WORKING POOR 49

TABLE 38: SUPPLEMENTING WAGES OF WORKING POOR -- Responses by Region 49

TABLE 39: INCREASED SUPPORT FOR SOCIAL PROGRAMS 51

TABLE 40: GOVERNMENTAL FINANCIAL BENEFITS -- Responses by Age 51

TABLE 41: WELFARE, UI & FAMILY ALLOWANCE -- INCREASE, SAME, DECREASE? 52

TABLE 42: FAVOUR A GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME? 53

TABLE 43: GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME -- Responses by Region 54

TABLE 44: WHEN SHOULD PENSION BENEFITS START? 55

TABLE 45: OLD AGE SECURITY -- Responses by Region 55

TABLE 46: TAKE A REDUCED RATE OF PENSION? 56

TABLE 47: LOWER PENSION AT A YOUNGER AGE -- Responses by Region 57

TABLE 48: LOWER PENSION AT A YOUNGER AGE -- Responses by Income 57

TABLE 49: TAX REFORMS BETTER OR WORSEN YOUR FINANCIAL SITUATION? 58

TABLE 50: FINANCIAL IMPACT OF TAX REFORM -- Responses by Sex and Region 59

TABLE 51: TAX REFORM & MEECH LAKE ACCORD -- Responses the same 60

TABLE 52: OPINIONS ON SOCIAL SERVICES -- FROM MOST TO LEAST FAVOURABLE 61

TABLE 53: MORE DAY CARE SUBSIDIES? 62

TABLE 54: SUBSIDIZED LICENCED DAY CARE -- Responses by Age and Sex 63

TABLE 55: UNIVERSAL DAY CARE? 64

TABLE 56: UNIVERSALITY/SELECTIVITY FOR DAY CARE -- Responses by Income 64

TABLE 57: DAY CARE STANDARDS 65

TABLE 58: STANDARDS FOR DAY CARE -- Responses by Region 65

TABLE 59: NEED HOME SUPPORT SERVICE? 66

TABLE 60: HOME SUPPORT SATISFACTION 66

TABLE 61: NOT RECEIVING HOME SUPPORT SERVICE? 67

TABLE 62: HOME SUPPORT SERVICES -- Responses by Region 67

TABLE 63: MORE MONEY TO HELP CRIME VICTIMS? 68

TABLE 64: KNOW AN ABUSED ELDER? 69

TABLE 65: CHARGING BATTERERS HAS HELPED ABUSED WIVES? 70

TABLE 66: IN A SELF-HELP GROUP? 70

TABLE 67: OTHER HOUSEHOLD MEMBER IN A SELF-HELP GROUP? 71

TABLE 68: HOUSEHOLD MEMBER IN A SELF-HELP GROUP? 71

TABLE 69: GROUP HOME FOR YOUNG OFFENDERS? 72

TABLE 70: COMMUNITY ALTERNATIVES TO PRISON? 72

TABLE 71: ROLE VALUES 73

TABLE 72: MEECH LAKE ACCCORD WILL BETTER SOCIAL PROGRAMS? 74

TABLE 73: SOCIAL IMPACT OF MEECH LAKE ACCORD 75

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We wish to thank all those who helped in carrying out the two surveys, especially the participants in two job re-entry projects who were critical to the achievement of both social development opinion polls. A high level of commitment, responsibility and energy was maintained throughout the survey periods in June 1987 and March 1988. Their names follow:

SIETP II

Laurie Anderson
Krystyna Bielanska
Janice Blain
Lydia Cheung
Nancy Daniels
Putul Das
Kit Depedro
Nancy Evans
Saba Fatemizadeh
Nancy Fraser
Isabel Palacios Hardy
Danka Iglewski
Elizabeth Jamieson
Emilia Lach
Nenita Lanthier
Joyce Lax
Lorna Lee
Svetlana Lenko
Cynthia Maloney
Azadeh Mosavat
Jean Noble
Pat Nyenhuis
Shakila Qadri
Eleanor Scott
Mary Spice
Faye Strike
Suzanne Torok
Namajene Wallace
Leslie Worden

SIETP III

Rojina Abbas
Anna Adamczyk
Patricia Barnes
Catherine Black
Janet Boswell
Paula Bright
Judy Burns
Christine Cadovious
Donna Guindon
Arthence Henry
Camilla Koo
Janet Lane
Eileen Lemarquis
Joan Morin
Linda Page
Irena Prestera
Barbara Shanahan
Theresa Siola
Helen Stone

In June 1987 the interviews for the province of Quebec were conducted by volunteers and CCSD staff in Montreal. The high quality of work accomplished in a short space of time by the following persons is very much appreciated:

Francois Berard
Manon Bureau
Monique Deschenes
Manon Desruisseaux
Manon Fontaine
Therese Roberge
Lise Beaudry
Florence Chapdelaine
Lise Desjardins
Suzanne Filion
Francois Lafaille
Marina Turcotte

Claude Quiviger Jocelyne Doucet Lise Desjardins

[In March 1988 the french language interviews were conducted by project members].

We thank Dr. MaryAnn McLaughlin for providing instruction in the art of sampling, Joy and Lorne Bowerman of R&L MicroServices for their help in computing the data, Jane Callen for managing the first poll and Suzanne Torok the second, and CCSD staff and key informants in the construction of the questionnaire, analysis of the data, and organization of the press release. Our thanks also to Professor John DeVries from the Department of Sociology at Carleton University for his invaluable advice, and Susan Lensen of Statistics Canada for her instructions on the art of interviewing.

The surveys were carried out with the financial assistance of the Job Entry Program of the Canadian Job Strategy of Employment and Immigration Canada, and the Canadian Council on Social Development. These polls are the first to be actually conducted (versus commissioned) by the Council, and we consider them both very credible. However, there are bound to be errors and omissions and they should be attributed to me. Any comments or criticisms would be most welcome, and a useful contribution to similar efforts in the future.

Harry MacKay, Senior Researcher, CCSD

FOREWORD

The Canadian Council on Social Development (CCSD) is pleased to release these two polls on social development in order to inform the public, social policy makers and the work of our own Council.

At the Council we have integrated the findings of both polls with a consultation of our membership and key informants to help set our program priorities.

The views of citizens on various social policy stances of the CCSD will be communicated to governments in order to advance the formulation of progressive social policies and programs. On those social policy stances where there is little public support, we will consider whether a public education program is required, so as to try to change opinion in favour of one or several much needed social policy initiatives.

On behalf of the Board of Governors, I want to express our thanks to the job re-entry trainees in the Social Information Exchange Training Project II and III for their three months of social research work.

Terrance M. Hunsley
Executive Director
The Canadian Council on Social Development

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF TWO SOCIAL OPINION POLLS

National opinion polls on social development were conducted in June 1987 and March 1988 by the Canadian Council on Social Development to guage public views on social issues and social policies to do with employment, income security and personal social services.

The polls were conducted of a random sample of the Canadian population. Results may be four percentage points out either way, 19 times out of 20.

#1 PROBLEM

The #1 problem in Canada is unemployment, with the economy a distant second.

TOP TEN SOCIAL ISSUES

The "top ten" social issues over the two polls, with more than three-quarters of the national representative sample giving their approval, were:

1. raise the minimum wage
2. set standards for quality day care
3. put more money into transition homes and counselling services for victims of family violence
4. provide work experience for never-employed youth
5. pro-rate benefits for part-time workers
6. lower interest rates to create new businesses and jobs
7. governments to create jobs where the unemployed live
8. provide wage subsidies to employers who create new jobs
9. charge batterers in order to help abused women
10. support small group homes for young offenders in own neighbourhood

--- and just missing the top ten was approval of a guaranteed income, with 76% of the sample giving it their blessing.

It is of special interest to the CCSD that persons from low household incomes, almost invariably, and low formal education, almost as often, supported increased resources to or improvements in each social issue.

Harry MacKay, Senior Researcher
Canadian Council on Social Development
55 Parkdale Avenue, Ottawa, Ontario, K1Y 4G1

I. INTRODUCTION

The Canadian Council on Social Development (CCSD), a national private non-profit social research and advocacy organization (since 1920), commissioned a social opinion poll in 1974, which was conducted by the Centre de Recherche sur l'Opinion Publique (C.R.O.P.). The findings were published by CCSD in A Question Of Needs in 1975. In the intervening 13 years, many changes have taken place in the population, and in public attitudes toward social issues. A Council sponsored job re-entry project was an obvious opportunity to catch up on the Canadian public's perception of social issues in the latter 1980s.

Women with post-secondary education who were re-entering the labour force were being trained in collecting, computing, and communicating social information; the conduct of a social opinion poll as a 'work incubation experience' was seen to be an enhancement of this nine-month project.

A national opinion poll on social issues seemed a ready vehicle to test public reception of the Council's 'Work & Income in the 90s' proposals, and an opportunity to learn what people think about current and future division of responsibility for social development, as well as to assess the level of public support for various types of social programs. It was also seen to be an opportunity to consult the general public in the setting of program priorities for the Council's work over the next few years. In addition, it was hoped that the communication of the findings to governments would lead to improvements in social policies and programs across the country.

The carrying out of polls by the Council was also seen to allow the development of polling expertise that could, if successful, lead to periodic polling on important social issues, possibly in concert with other social organizations.

Some of the elements of the poll process were the construction of the questions on the social concerns of employment, income security, and social services by the trainees in the Social Information Exchange Training Project (II) and revised by CCSD program staff, and the carrying out of the interviews with the randomly selected sample of 1000 Canadians, the analysis, and communication of the results.

The Council hopes that periodic polling will allow a replication of several questions posed in these polls, and the richness of longitudinal surveys will enhance the formulation of social policy by the CCSD and others interested in social development.

II. METHODOLOGY

The study is based on the results of 1006 interviews in June 1987 and 1003 in March 1988 (large enough for 100 responses in major and 20 - 50 in minor data categories) conducted with a representative sample of Canadians, 18 years of age and over. The sample was randomly selected proportionate to region, size of community, age and sex, in order to ensure representativeness.

In selecting respondents from within households, we used Statistics Canada's definition of the "household" (at the other end of the telephone), that is:

> 'A person or a group of persons who occupy a dwelling and do not have a usual place of residence elsewhere in Canada. It usually consists of a family group with or without lodgers, employees, etc. However, it may consist of two or more families sharing a dwelling, a group of unrelated persons, or one person living alone.'

Well over 100 interviews were held in a pre-test of the draft questionnaire, and consequently, a number of revisions were made. Telephone interviews averaged 10 minutes in length, with responses recorded on a nine-page (June 1987) and seven-page (March 1988) questionnaire (copies of the English and French language questionnaires are available). The responses were then put onto a computerized data base.

A survey based on a sample of this size allows a range of error of four percentage points at the 95% level of confidence, so that 19 times out of 20 such statistical results as shown would not occur by chance.

An evaluation of the first opinion poll by the trainees (immediately after the telephone interviews were completed) revealed the following important observations about the methodology:

-- ask pre-test respondents (after the interview is completed) what they believe each question asks, and what they intended by their responses

-- say where interviewer is calling from (the number of refusals dropped from 80 to 40 per evening, with 70 completions, when we introduced the fact that we were calling from Ottawa)

-- use transition phrases each time new subject matter is introduced (e.g., "Now I'm going to ask you some questions about day care")

-- do not use emotion laden descriptors which are so overpowering that the remainder of the question gets blocked out

(e.g., the use of Alcoholics Anonymous as an example of a self-help group led respondents to blurt out that they had never been drunk, or were not alcoholic)

-- introduce the last question about annual household income with the phrase, "And finally...", then do not pin people down to an exact figure, but rather offer ranges of income such as "in the 20s, in the 30s".

III. DESIGN OF THE SAMPLE

To gain an approximation of the adult civilian population in Canada (except persons who are institutionalized), we ascertained the percentage of the population living in each of the five regions in 1981 (Poll #1) and 1986 (Poll #2), and arrived at the following number of interviews to be conducted, and those actually realized:

TABLE 1: SAMPLE BY REGION

	June 1987		March 1988	
Region	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
Atlantic	90	91	90	92
Quebec	260	258	260	259
Ontario	360	360	360	361
Prairies/NWT	180	181	180	181
B.C./Yukon	115	116	110	110
Canada total:	1005	1006	1000	1003

This Table shows there was only a difference of two (maximum) interviews between target and actual number, for any of the five regions in both surveys.

The size of community was then considered, by assigning each to one of four strata (I: 500,000 +; II: 100,000 - 499,999; III: 10,000 - 99,999; IV: 1 - 9,999). The number of interviews to be completed in each Census Metropolitan Area according to its size was then calcuated for each region. For example: Toronto -- 136, Halifax -- 12, Medicine Hat -- 4, Bella Coola -- 1. Due to a low population density in stratum IV (1 - 9,999), a number of widely dispersed small towns and communities were listed, from which a single interview resulted.

The target and the number actually realized for each stratum is shown in the following:

TABLE 2: SAMPLE BY STRATUM

Stratum	June 1987 Target	June 1987 Actual	March 1988 Target	March 1988 Actual
I (500,000+)	468	476	467	469
II (100-499K)	147	143	147	147
III (10-99.9K)	159	159	156	157
IV (1- 9,999)	231	228	230	229
TOTAL:	1005	1006	1000	1002

Again, the size of difference was minimal between the target and actual number of interviews completed by strata.

A separate and overall target was established in order to interview an equal number of men and women, and proportionate to each of four age groups (according to their numbers in the 1986 Census), namely:

TABLE 3: SAMPLE BY AGE AND SEX

Age	% Male Target	% Male Actual		% Female Target	% Female Actual	
June 1987						
18-24	19.3	17.9	89	18.2	17.7	90
25-44	42.2	44.2	220	40.1	40.7	207
45-64	26.8	26.7	133	26.6	26.6	135
65 +	11.8	11.2	56	15.1	15.0	76
	100.1%	100.0%	N=498	100.0%	100.0%	N=508
March 1988						
18-24	16.7	16.2	80	15.4	15.9	81
25-44	44.5	44.3	218	42.5	42.4	216
45-64	26.3	27.2	134	25.7	25.5	130
65 +	12.4	12.4	61	16.3	16.3	83
	99.9%	100.1%	N=493	99.9%	100.1%	N=510

And again, the target and actual number of interviews completed by sex and age was very close. The largest variation was by less than two percentage points in the first poll, and less than one percentage point in the second.

We chose to conduct the poll on the basis of telephone interviews, at a considerable cost saving as compared to at-home interviews, and knowing that 99 per cent of Canadian households have a telephone. The random selection of telephone numbers (including unlisted numbers) was accomplished by listing the three-digit prefixes for each survey location, with the last four dgit combinations being computer generated (last two numbers for stratum IV).

Selection by sex and age became a necessity when stratification quotas were filled up.

The reasons for refusal most often cited were: 1) too busy or an inconvenient time to be interviewed, 2) lack of knowledge about social issues, and 3) inability to speak either English or French. In the data analysis, the reader can see 'who said what', which somewhat alleviates the problem posed by a biased sample (e.g., co-operation is more forthcoming from the more highly educated). In that full cooperation was not achieved, we cannot say that the national samples in the two polls are perfectly representative of the views of Canadians.

PROFILE OF THE RESPONDENTS

- 83% were born in Canada (831/1003)
- 82% were households with no children 12 - 17 years (817/1003)
- 79% were english speaking (794/1003)
- 75% had completed at least secondary school (753/1001)
- 72% were households with no children under 12 years (720/1003)
- 72% held a paid job or were seeking a paid job (715/1000)
- 70% of the households consisted of 2 - 4 persons (704/1002)
- 63% of households had annual incomes under $40,000 (602/955)
- 58% were married or living in common-law unions (581/1002)
- 51% were women (510/1003)
- 48% held/had held tertiary level/service jobs (460/954)
  (and 32% held/had held professional or managerial jobs)
- 47% were from cities of over 500,000 population (470/1003)
- 43% were 25 - 44 years of age (434/1003)

The opinions of the respondents are analyzed by these demographic variables. Where significant differences in opinion occur by one or several demographic variables, these are presented in a Table and described in a written analysis.

IV. A SUMMARY OF PRINCIPAL FINDINGS

- The #1 social problem is unemployment
- A majority of Canadians favoured the following policies to fight unemployment:

IN FAVOUR of... [ordered most to least with priority to March88]	June87	Mar88
raise the minimum wage (so said respondents from Nova Scotia and British Columbia	--	95%
provide work experience for never-employed youth	--	89%
pro-rate benefits for part-time workers	86%	--
lower interest rates to create new business/jobs	--	84%
raise minimum wage [so said respondents in Quebec (83%), Alberta (84%), and Newfoundland (87%)]	--	83%
governments to create jobs where unemployed live	80%	--
wage subsidies to employers who create new jobs	--	80%
assign a high rating to schooling/training role	--	79%
give money to non-profit orgs. to create jobs	75%	--
give money to commercial businesses to create jobs	72%	--
governments to help people to move where jobs are	69%	--
guarantee training for long-term unemployed	80%	67%
raise minimum wage [so said respondents in Saskatchewan (66%), New Brunswick (69%), and Ontario (69%)]	--	66%
respond to need for more education/jobs skills	--	57%
raise minimum wage [so said respondents in New Brunswick (69%), and Ontario (69%)]	--	54%
respond to need for more education/jobs skills	--	57%
raise minimum wage [said Manitobans (54%)]	--	54%
governments to fight unemployment harder	65%	53%
expand business/economy/trade to create jobs	--	52%

- A majority of Canadians favoured the following improvements to income security:

OPINIONS ON INCOME SECURITY -- FROM MOST TO LEAST FAVOURABLE

IN FAVOUR of... [ordered most to least with priority to March88]	Jun87	Mar88
establish a Guaranteed Annual Income	78%	76%
increase Old Age Security	74%	--
increase the Guaranteed Income Supplement	72%	--
supplement the wages of the working poor	64%	69%
worker acceptance of lower early pension	69%	--
lower the pensionable age below 65 years	68%	64%
increase benefits from Canada/Quebec Pension Plan	59%	--
increase Veteran's Allowance	54%	--

- A majority of Canadians supported the following improvements in the personal social services:

OPINIONS ON SOCIAL SERVICES -- FROM MOST TO LEAST FAVOURABLE

IN FAVOUR of... [ordered most to least with priority to March88]	Jun87	Mar88
set standards for quality day care	95%	--
more money into transition home and counselling services for victims of family violence	91%	--
rate value of parenting 8-10 points on a maximum scale of 10	--	81%
charging of batterers has helped abused women	--	79%
support introduction of a small group home for young offenders in their neighbourhood	--	77%
support community-based counselling and community service programs for offenders	--	75%
make day care free (either to some, or all)	75%	--
more subsidy dollars for licenced day care	67%	--

o It is of general interest where the Canadian public stand on these social measures, but it is of special interest to the Canadian Council on Social Development how the disadvantaged perceive the issues, so that the Council can speak with and for them in the betterment of life for all Canadians.

The level of concern of the disadvantaged about employment/unemployment was considerably (five or more percentage points) higher on such matters as:

A. unemployment being the #1 problem Canadians face

B. governments should do more to fight unemployment

In March 1988 the disadvantaged also more strongly favoured ways to fight unemployment. Those with low formal education [LFE] and/or low household incomes [LHI] registered at least five percentage points higher levels (than the total sample) of support for:

	5+%	5+%
1. skills training as best way to create jobs		LHI
3. creating local jobs	LFE	LHI
4. guaranteeing job training to long-term unemployed	LFE	LHI
guaranteeing a job to the long term unemployed	LFE	LHI
5. providing work experience for never-employed youth		LHI
6. providing wage subsidies to employers creating jobs	LFE	LHI
8. advancing unemployment insurance benefits in a lump sum to the unemployed to create own jobs	LFE	LHI
14. opposition to free trade because it is likely to worsen job prospects	LFE	LHI
15. raising the minimum wage	LFE	LHI

The level of support from the disadvantaged for income security programs was considerably higher (five or more percentage points higher than for the total sample) as well:

	5+%	5+%
1. supplement the wages of the working poor	LFE	LHI
3. guarantee annual incomes	LFE	LHI
4. lower the pensionable age	LFE	LHI

Persons with low formal education and of low household income also supported current/improved personal social services considerably more (5+%) than the total sample:

		5+%	5+%
1.	provide mode day care subsidies for quality day care	LFE	LHI
2.	licenced day care free to some or all		LHI
4.	provision of home support service to meet a need	LFE	LHI
6.	personally know an abused elder		LHI
7.	believe charging batterers helps abused women	LFE	LHI
8.	participate in a self-help group		LHI
9.	support group homes for young offenders		LHI
10.	support community alternatives to prison		LHI
11.	rate parenting highly	LFE	LHI

The above shows that persons with low household income [LHI] invariably support increased resources to or improved social programs. Those with low formal education [LFE] give support almost as often with respect to employment, income security and personal social services.

V. DETAILED FINDINGS

SECTION I : EMPLOYMENT

In "Consultation '85" and "Consultation '87" the Council surveyed its members in order to set program priorities. Three top priorities emerged in the following order. We show here the number of questions devoted to each of these priority areas in the national opinion polls:

	Concern	JUNE 87 Poll	MARCH 88 Poll
#1:	employment	13 Qns	20 Qns
#2:	income security	5 Qns	3 Qns
#3:	social services	6 Qns	9 Qns

In Poll #1 the remaining five questions were about the concern of 'citizenship' (2 Qns), the impact of the Meech Lake Accord on social programs, and of tax reform measures on personal financial situation. In Poll #2 all questions posed were on the top three concerns of the CCSD.

The findings will be presented in the order of priority established by the membership of the Canadian Council on Social Development, with the concern of 'employment' being dealt with first.

Let us deal first with a question which turned out to be about unemployment. We asked:

"What is the most important problem Canadians face?"

-- the answer in both polls was "unemployment".

A. Most Important Social Problem

The last opinion question asked in Poll #1 turned out to relate to employment, namely, that unemployment is considered "the most important problem that Canadians face". This question was repeated in Poll #2 and led off the telephone interview. The following Table shows -- of those expressing an opinion -- "unemployment" was the #1 problem that Canadians face, both in 1987 (56%) and 1988 (31%). This considerable drop is likely attributable to the declining rate of unemployment, from a seasonally adjusted rate of 8.9% in June 1987 to 7.8% in March 1988.

TABLE 4
MOST IMPORTANT PROBLEM THAT CANADIANS FACE

	JUNE87	MARCH88
UNEMPLOYMENT	506 (56%)	281 (31%)
ECONOMY/INFLATION/DEFICIT/INT.RATES	91 (10%)	128 (14%)
1987:51 18 19 3		
1988:69 34 21 4		
FREE TRADE.....	18 (2%)	76 (8%)
HEALTH / AIDS / ABORTION.....	13 (1%)	52 (6%)
1987: 9 4 0		
1988:10 11 31		
POVERTY/LOW WAGES/HOUSING/REGL DISPAR	65 (7%)	53 (6%)
1987:46 3 7 9		
1988:28 6 17 2		
OTHER [taxes, unity, immigration, language]	205 (23%)	328 (36%)
With opinion	898 (99%)	918(101%)

A distant second place concern in both polls (1987: 10%; 1988: 14%) was the economy (including inflation, the federal deficit, and interest rates), though four percentage points higher in 1988.

Free trade rose from a 2% to an 8% level of concern for the "most important problem" that Canadians face. Abortion and AIDS raised the health issue from 1% to a 6% level of concern. Poverty remained stable at 7% (1987), then 6% (1988).

Analysis:
Eight independent variables were correlated with all the questions about employment and unemployment, namely:

- sex
- age group
- born in Canada (yes or no)
- income level
- region of the country
- strata (from rural to metro)
- marital status
- educational level

-- and they are presented in the order of their significance.

Of the 281 (31%) respondents who identified unemployment as the most important problem that Canadians face, they were more likely to be:

with a lower household income (below $70,000/yr. 32%, as compared to above $70,000/yr. 17%)

from the most economically disadvantaged region of the country -- 44% for the Atlantic provinces versus 22% for Ontario

in the labour force (youth 37%, prime age 30%, older 33%, and not seniors 65+ years: 19%)

born in Canada (32%, versus 22% of immigrants); and,

Surprisingly, of those who identified unemployment as the most important problem, they did not then say that governments should guarantee a job for persons unemployed for more than four months (only 39% said both, five percentage points higher than the "yes" response of the total sample on the question of guaranteeing jobs).

We were most interested in how Canadians thought unemployment (the #1 problem) should be fought. The following are the opinions (from most to least favourable in March 1988) of the national representative sample on ways to fight unemployment.

TABLE 5
WAYS TO FIGHT UNEMPLOYMENT -- FROM MOST TO LEAST FAVOURABLE

IN FAVOUR of...

	JUNE87	MARCH88
raise the minimum wage [said respondents in Nova Scotia and B.C.]	--	95%
provide work experience for never-employed youth	--	89%
pro-rate benefits for part-time workers	86%	--
lower interest rates to create new business/jobs	--	84%
raise minimum wage [said respondents in Quebec (83%), Alberta (84%), and Newfoundland (87%)]	--	83%
governments to create jobs where unemployed live	80%	--
wage subsidies to employers who create new jobs	--	80%
assign a high rating to schooling/training role	--	79%
give money to non-profit orgs. to create jobs	75%	--
give money to commercial businesses to create jobs	72%	--
governments to help people to move where jobs are	69%	--
guarantee training for long-term unemployed	80%	67%
raise minimum wage [said respondents in Saskatchewan (66%), New Brunswick (69%), and Ontario (69%)]	--	66%
respond to need for more education/jobs skills	--	57%
raise minimum wage [said Manitobans (54%)]	--	54%
governments to fight unemployment harder	65%	53%
expand business/economy/trade to create jobs	--	52%
would take cut in pay for working fewer hours	50%	47%
give advance UI to unemployed to create own job	--	45%
guarantee a job for long-term unemployed	32%	34%
#1 problem in Canada is: unemployment	56%	31%

get free trade agreement to improve jobs	--	30%
1st priority in immigration policy: fill jobs	24%	--

The details follow for each question on employment, with percentages shown in parentheses.

B. Fighting Unemployment

The first question in Poll #1 was the following:

> "Well over one million Canadians are currently unemployed, with the official national unemployment rate at around nine per cent. Do you think governments are doing enough to fight unemployment?"

The prelude was dropped in Poll #2 because it was felt that it invited a negative response. Thus, we cannot say the question is the same, as it was posed in March 1988 in this way:

> "Do you think governments are doing enough to fight unemployment?"

TABLE 6
GOVERNMENTS ARE DOING ENOUGH TO FIGHT UNEMPLOYMENT?

	JUNE87	MARCH88
Yes.....	325 (35%)	427 (47%)
No.....	603 (65%)	477 (53%)
With opinion	928 (100%)	904 (100%)

If one believed the prelude to the question did not bias the answer in Poll #1, then for those who expressed an opinion (almost all did), two-thirds (65%) thought governments were not doing enough in June 1987, while that view had dropped to almost one-half (53%) nine months later.

We can more confidently say that Canadians are evenly split on the question of doing enough to fight unemployment: one-half think governments are doing enough, and one-half think governments are not doing enough to fight unemployment in 1988.

Analysis:
Of the 477 (53%) of the respondents stating governments are not doing enough to fight unemployment, they were more likely to be:

- with a lower household income [below $20,000/yr.(61%), versus above $80,000 (27%)]

from the most economically disadvantaged region, the Atlantic (64%), contrasted with Ontario (at 45%)

and with some high school education (61%) while only 41% of university graduates held this opinion

TABLE 7
FIGHTING UNEMPLOYMENT -- Responses By Region
(percentages in parenthesis)

REGION	RESPONSE JUNE87 Yes	No	No opinion	Total
Atlantic	35 (38.5)	51 (56.0)	5 (5.5)	91 (100)
Quebec	67 (26.0)	174 (67.4)	17 (6.6)	258 (100)
Ontario	134 (37.2)	185 (51.4)	41 (11.4)	360 (100)
Prairies/NWT	61 (33.7)	112 (61.9)	8 (4.4)	181 (100)
B.C./Yukon	28 (24.1)	81 (69.8)	7 (6.0)	116(99.9)
Canada	325 (32.3)	603 (59.9)	78 (7.8)	1006 (100)

The exception to the national average of two-fifths (59.9) of the total sample (including non-responses) believing (in June 1987) governments were not doing enough about employment was the case of Ontario (51.4) on the low side, with a considerable percentage (11.4) not answering yes or no. On the high side was Quebec (67.4) and B.C. (69.8).

As Ontario has enjoyed a lower unemployment rate than the other Provinces, and almost all of the new job creation in the past three years, it is not surprising that interviewees were less negative about government action with respect to unemployment. One could speculate that residents in the Atlantic were less critical because other areas were also experiencing higher than usual rates of unemployment, whereas those in British Columbia were quite unaccustomed to high unemployment and thus were most critical of all.

WAYS TO FIGHT UNEMPLOYMENT

Just how governments should fight unemployment was explored through fifteen questions over the two polls. We asked:

1. What is the best way to create jobs?
2. Create commercial jobs? Create non-profit jobs?
3. Create jobs where unemployed live or move unemployed to jobs?
4. Guarantee training or a job to long-term unemployed?
5. Provide work experience for never-employed youth?
6. Provide wage subsidies to employers who create jobs?
7. Lower interest rates to create new business and new jobs?
8. Advance UI benefits to unemployed to create their own jobs?
9. Pro-rate benefits for part-time workers?
10. Redistribute work: take cut in pay for working less time?
11. Increase immigration to fill vacant jobs?
12. Increase work adjustment training opportunities?
13. Assign a high rating to schooling/training?
14. Get free trade agreement with USA to improve job prospects?
15. Raise the minimum hourly wage in your province?

1. What is the Best Way to Create Jobs?

Before asking whether the interviewee supported specific employment policies, we asked just what was the best way to create jobs.

TABLE 8
WHAT IS THE BEST WAY TO CREATE JOBS?

	MARCH88	
Expand business/Improve economy/More trade... (245 / 119 / 41)	405	(52%)
Skills training / education.....	175	(22%)
Work redistribution / government incentives..	40	(5%)
Other.....	160	(21%)
With opinion	780	(100%)

Improving the economy, expanding business and industry, and more trade were the choice of one-half (52%) of those with opinions, and skills training/education second with support from one-quarter (22%) of the sample.

Analysis:
Of the 175 (30%) of the interviewees agreeing the best way to create jobs is "more skills training", they were likely to be:

with the lowest household income (less than $10,000/yr. 42%, as contrasted with 16% (7 persons) of highest income

from the most economically advantaged region, Ontario (37%, with little support for skills training from the Atlantic 19%)

youth (40%) or seniors (39%)

2. Create Commercial and Non-profit Jobs?

In June 1987 we led off the questions on government actions to support employment creation by looking at support for job creation in both commercial and non-profit organizations.

"Do you think governments should give money to commercial businesses to create jobs?"

TABLE 9
COMMERCIAL JOB CREATION?

	JUNE87
Yes.....	694 (72%)
No.....	270 (28%)
With opinion	964 (100%)

"Do you think governments should give money to non-profit organizations to create jobs?"

TABLE 10
NON-PROFIT JOB CREATION?

	JUNE87
Yes.....	705 (75%)
No.....	236 (25%)
With opinion	941 (100%)

Almost all (19-in-20) expressed an opinion on the subject of job creation, and three-quarters expressed the view that governments should give money to commercial businesses (72%) and to nonprofit organizations (75%) to create jobs. This equal favouring of for-profit and non-profit is not reflected in current federal policy which favours the former over the latter.

CREATING JOBS IN NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATIONS

"Do you think governments should give money to non-profit organizations to create jobs"?

Table 11 shows the number of respondents with an opinion across Canada by region.

TABLE 11

CREATING JOBS IN NON-PROFIT ORGS -- Responses by Region
(percentages in parenthesis)

RESPONSE JUNE87

REGION	Yes	No	Total
Atlantic	60 (71.4)	24 (28.6)	84 (100)
Quebec	201 (82.0)	43 (17.6)	244 (100)
Ontario	238 (70.8)	98 (29.1)	366 (100)
Prairies/NWT	130 (76.0)	41 (24.0)	171 (100)
B.C./Yukon	77 (72.0)	30 (28.0)	107 (100)
Canada	705 (74.9)	236 (25.1)	1006 (100)

Analysis:
Three-fourths (74.9%) of respondents who expressed an opinion from all five regions (give or take a few percentage points) thought governments should give money to non-profit organizations to create jobs.

Higher-income respondents gave the same degree of support as low-income earners for the idea of governments financially assisting non-profit organizations to create jobs.

All age groups were in favor of governments giving money to non-profit organizations to create jobs.

3. Create Jobs Where Unemployed Live or Move People to Jobs?

Out of a concern for family well-being we wanted to assess if there was more support for job creation where the unemployed live, rather than have the unemployed leave their families for jobs elsewhere. The question asked was:

"Do you believe governments should provide financial assistance to create jobs where the unemployed live?"

TABLE 12
JOB CREATION AT HOME?

	JUNE87
Yes.....	778 (80%)
No.....	194 (20%)
With opinion	966 (100%)

"Do you believe governments should provide financial assistance to move the unemployed to where the jobs are?"

TABLE 13
JOB CREATION AWAY FROM HOME?

	JUNE87
Yes.....	671 (69%)
No.....	306 (31%)
With opinion	977 (100%)

More interviewees believed governments should provide financial assistance to create the jobs where the unemployed live (80%), than move the unemployed to where the jobs are (69%).
Table 14 presents the data on support for local job creation, by region.

TABLE 14
CREATE JOBS LOCALLY -- Responses by Region
(percentages in parenthesis)

	RESPONSE JUNE87					
REGION	Yes		No		Total	
Atlantic	70	(79.5)	18	(20.5)	88	(100)
Quebec	266	(76.9)	80	(23.1)	346	(100)
Ontario	133	(77.3)	39	(22.7)	172	(100)
Prairies/NWT	228	(90.5)	24	(9.5)	252	(100)
B.C./Yukon	81	(71.1)	33	(28.9)	114	(100)
Canada	778	(80.0)	194	(20.0)	972	(100)

Table 15 presents the views of Canadians, on a regional basis, as to the provision of financial assistance to move the unemployed to where the jobs are.

TABLE 15

MOVE UNEMPLOYED -- Responses by Region
(percentages in parenthesis)

RESPONSE JUNE87

REGION	Yes		No		Total	
Atlantic	63	(71.6)	25	(28.4)	88	(100)
Quebec	228	(65.5)	120	(34.5)	348	(100)
Ontario	117	(66.5)	59	(33.5)	176	(100)
Prairies/NWT	192	(76.8)	58	(23.2)	250	(100)
B.C./Yukon	70	(61.4)	44	(38.6)	114	(100)
Canada	670	(68.6)	306	(31.4)	976	(100)

Of the people who gave an opinion, most believed that governments should provide financial assistance to create jobs where the unemployed live (80%), while fewer felt governments should help move the unemployed to where the jobs are (68.7%).

Analysis:
The respondents in favour of both approaches seemed to come from the 25-44 age group. In terms of education, the largest number of people in favour of both questions had an elementary level of education (Q6: 83.2%, and Q7: 76.2%).

By region, respondents from the Prairies/NWT seemed to favour both Q6 and Q7 (90.5% and 76.8%, respectively). The largest number of people answering "no" to both questions were from B.C./Yukon (Q6 28.9% and Q7 38.6%).

In terms of income, the largest number of people with an opinion who answered "yes" to both questions Q6 and Q7 (82.6% and 76.1% respectively), had an income of under $10,000/year.

When cross-tabulating by marital status, we get an interesting result in that the largest number of respondents with an opinion who answered "yes" to both questions were divorced persons (Q6: 86%, Q7: 81.8%).

4. Guarantee of Training or Job to Long-Term Unemployed?

Strong government action in terms of providing guarantees of access to government programs was assessed vis-a-vis job training and employment.

> "For those who have been unemployed for over four months... Do you think governments should guarantee opportunities for job training?"

TABLE 16
GUARANTEE JOB TRAINING?

	JUNE87	MARCH88
Yes.....	782 (80%)	646 (67%)
No.....	196 (20%)	318 (33%)
With opinion	978 (100%)	964 (100%)

The question on guaranteeing a job was:

> "For those who have been unemployed for over four months... Do you think governments should guarantee a job?"

TABLE 17
GUARANTEE A JOB?

	JUNE87	MARCH88
Yes.....	311 (32%)	324 (34%)
No.....	655 (68%)	621 (66%)
With opinion	966 (100.0)	945 (100%)

Our definition of long-term unemployment was captured in the question by the phrase, "unemployed more than four months", in the belief that persons unemployed for such a period of time are likely to remain unemployed still longer. Respondents had little difficulty answering these two questions, with contrasting responses. In Poll #1, while four-fifths favoured guaranteeing training, only one-third thought governments should guarantee a job to the long-term unemployed. In Poll #2, support for guarantee of job training declined from four-fifths to two-thirds, but guaranteeing a job to long-term unemployed individuals remained the same at a level of one-third support from the sample.

GUARANTEE A JOB?
On the question of guaranteeing a job to the long-term unemployed, two-thirds of the respondents who expressed an opinion on this question answered "No" both times.

Analysis:
Of the one-third favouring a job guarantee, they were likely to be:

persons with elementary education (being 61% in favour of job guarantees in May 1987, 55% June 1988) [in June 1988 the correlations were in perfect order from lowest to highest level of education: 55%, 46%, 40%, 28%, 21% in favour]

residents of Quebec in 1988 (56% in favour -- B.C. 18%, Ontario 24%), or french speaking (64%, English 27%)

those with household income under $20,000 per year (52% '87, 51% in '88, as contrasted with 19% of persons from households above $60,000/year incomes in 1988)

farmers, loggers, fishermen (48%, only 21% of professionals or managers in 1988 in a special tabulation)

The following table shows an interesting difference in response by language and sex.

TABLE 18
JOB GUARANTEE, BY LANGUAGE & SEX

RESPONSE JUNE87

LANGUAGE/SEX		YES	NO
FRENCH	FEMALE	(49.1)	(50.1)
	MALE	(47.9)	(52.1)
ENGLISH	FEMALE	(35.9)	(45.9)
	MALE	(17.4)	(82.6)

The French speaking respondents answered "Yes" at a very similar rate of 49.1% for females and 47.9% for males. By constrast, the English speaking females were more likely to answer "Yes" (35.9%) than English speaking males (17.4%).

GUARANTEE JOB TRAINING?
Table 19 presents the views of those polled on the question of guaranteeing job training to the long-term unemployed, by region.

TABLE 19

GUARANTEE OF JOB TRAINING -- Responses By Region
(percentages in parenthesis)

RESPONSE JUNE87

REGION	Yes	No	Total
Atlantic	77 (84.6)	14 (15.4)	91 (100)
Quebec	206 (82.7)	43 (17.3)	249 (100)
Ontario	278 (80.1)	69 (19.9)	347 (100)
Prairies/NWT	137 (77.0)	41 (23.0)	178 (100)
B.C./Yukon	83 (74.1)	29 (25.9)	112 (100)
Canada	781 (79.9)	196 (20.1)	977 (100)

Analysis:
Of those who responded, 4-in-5 (79.9%) felt governments should guarantee opportunities for job training to the long-term (four or more months) unemployed. This had dropped to 67% nine months later.

The positive responses by region decreased from east to west, from the Atlantic (84.6%) to Pacific (74.1%). By June 1988 only Quebec had not dropped 14-to-17 percentage points, declining one-half the rate of the other regions.

There were interesting differences by marital status. Divorced (93.9%) and separated (86.4%) were more in favour of training guarantees than married (78.9%) or single individuals (73.5%). This relationship held up nine months later.

Those with the least education were most in favour of a training guarantee in 1988 (81% of those with elementary education, 59% of university graduates).

And persons from the poorest households in 1988 highly favoured governments guaranteeing job training for the long-term unemployed (80% of those from under $20,000/year, 46% from $60,000 year plus).

5. Provide Work Experience for Never-Employed Youth?

We asked:

> "Should governments provide work experience for unemployed youth who have never held a job?"

TABLE 20
PROVIDE WORK EXPERIENCE FOR UNEMPLOYED YOUTH?

	MARCH88	
Yes.....	872	(89%)
No.....	105	(11%)
With opinion	977	(100%)

The overwhelming (89%) response was positive with regards to providing work experience for unemployed youth who have never held a job.

Analysis:
The only identifiable group not highly favouring the provision of work experience for unemployed youth who have never held a job was the one with the highest household income (over $80,000/year) at a level of 3-in-4 (74%).

6. Provide Wage Subsidies To Employers Who Create Jobs?

In March 1988, respondents were asked:

> "For employers who create new jobs, are you in favour of governments giving full, partial, or no wage subsidies?"

The national sample responded in the following way...

TABLE 21
JOB CREATION THROUGH WAGE SUBSIDIES TO EMPLOYERS?

	MARCH88	
Full subsidies...	99	(10%)
Partial subsidies	672	(70%)
No subsidies.....	192	(20%)
With opinion	963	(100%)

Over two-thirds (70%) expressed the opinion that partial subsidies should be paid by government to employers who create new jobs, with 4-in-5 supporting full or partial subsidies.

Analysis:
As compared to the total sample response of 10 per cent in favour of full subsidies, twice as much support came from those with an elementary education (23%), lowest income households of under $10,000/year (21%), and youth (19%).

7. Lower Interest Rates to Create New Business/Jobs?

To explore whether Canadians favour lowering of interest rates in order that new businesses might be established, and new jobs created, we asked:

> "Do you think new jobs will be created by new business through lowering interest rates?"

TABLE 22
LOWER INTEREST RATES TO CREATE JOBS?

	MARCH88	
Yes.....	759	(84%)
No.....	146	(16%)
With opinion	905	(100%)

Of the 905 persons expressing an opinion, more than 4 in 5 felt new jobs would be created by new business through the lowering of interest rates.

Analysis:
This item was evenly supported through each of the eight independent variables, with 91% support noted in British Columbia and by the least educated.

8. Advance (Lump Sum) UI Benefits to Unemployed to Create Own Jobs?

We explored the level of support for lump sum Unemployment Insurance Benefits (UIB) to unemployed persons, in advance, in order that they might use the money (they might receive anyway if they went on to exhaust their benefits) to create their own job (and possibly jobs for others as well). The question was asked, thusly:

> "For unemployed persons to create their own jobs, are you in favour of a lump sum advance unemployed insurance payment?"

TABLE 23
LUMP SUM UIB TO CREATE JOBS?

	MARCH88	
Yes.....	423	(45%)
No.....	528	(56%)
With opinion	951	(101%)

Almost everyone answered this question, and almost one-half (45%) thought a lump sum advance UI payment could be made to the unemployed, so that they might use the money to create their own jobs.

Analysis:
Of the 423 (45%) who said a lump sum advance UI payment could be made, they were likely to be:

youth (54% supported a lump sum advance UI payment)

those with an elementary school education (53% in favour)

from low income households (50% of those under $30,000 -- 38% of those over $50,000)

married (50%) or separated/divorced/widowed (48% in favour)

from Quebec (50% support)

9. Pro-rate Benefits for Part-Time Workers?

Respondents felt very strongly that the fringe benefits of part-time workers should be pro-rated according to the amount of time worked. Their views were solicited by this question:

> "Part-time workers usually do not receive fringe benefits. Do you think someone who works half-time should get one-half the fringe benefits, like medical and pension coverage, that a full-time worker receives?

TABLE 24
PRO-RATE BENEFITS FOR PART-TIMERS?

	JUNE87	
Yes.....	839	(86%)
No.....	132	(13%)
With opinion	971	(99%)

One could say that almost all (86%) of those with an opinion favoured pro-rated benefits, that is, so that a person working half-time would enjoy one-half the fringe benefits usually received by full-time workers (such as medical and pension coverage).

Analysis:
Due to the preponderance of support for this employment policy, the responses to this question provided few distinctions by region, age, sex, education, holding a paid job, or language. However, the results show a substantial difference of about twenty percentage points between those married or living together (common-law) and the widowed in their support of benefits for part-time work. This may be credited to the fact that the widowed, mostly being in the 65+ age group and retired, are less likely to benefit from such a program.

10. Redistribute Work: Take Cut in Pay for Working Less Time?

To ascertain if work might be created through redistribution, that is, through less work time by those already employed, and freed up work opportunities for the unemployed, we asked those who preferred to work less if they would take a cut in pay.

The respondent was first asked if he/she held or had held a paid job. If "yes" in Poll #1, then the next question was whether the worker preferred to work more, the same, or fewer hours per week, or weeks per year. In Poll #2, the respondent was asked how many hours per week they worked in current/last job, and then how many hours per week they preferred to work.

TABLE 25
MORE, SAME, OR FEWER HOURS?

	JUNE87
More hours.....	90 (15%)
Same.....	346 (57%)
Fewer hours....	172 (28%)
With opinion	608 (100%)

In June 1987 almost twice as many wanted to work fewer hours than more hours, and of those wanting to work fewer hours one-half expressed a willingness to take a cut in pay, as did the March 1988 sample, as revealed in the answer to this question:

"If you did work less time in your paid job, would you be willing to take a cut in pay?"

TABLE 26
LESS WORK TIME WITH CUT IN PAY?

	JUNE87	MARCH88
Yes.....	79 (50%)	154 (47%)
No.....	80 (50%)	176 (53%)
With opinion	159 (100%)	330 (100%)

One-half of those wanting to work fewer hours expressed a willingness to accept less money for less time worked, both in the June 1987 and March 1988 polls.

[In the second poll, respondents were asked how many hours per week they usually worked in their last paid job, and then asked how many hours per week they preferred to work. For those who responded "fewer hours", we asked whether they would be willing to take a cut in pay to match the cut in hours.]

Analysis:
Of the 136 of labour force age (15-64 years), 136 (45%) volunteered to take a cut in pay for fewer hours worked,

45-64 year olds gave this most support (55%, and youth least support 37%)

Of the 154 who liked the idea, they were likely to be:

persons from Ontario (54%), and/or metropolitan areas (51%), and/or single (50%)

TABLE 27

TAKE CUT IN PAY -- Responses by Level of Income
(percentages in parenthesis)

	WOULD TAKE CUT IN PAY	
	JUNE87	MARCH88
INCOME	Yes	Yes
LOW (Under $39,000)	18 (38%)	77 (45%)
MEDIUM ($40,- $59,000)	33 (65%)	43 (48%)
HIGH ($60,000 & Up)	27 (50.0)	26 (45%)
CANADA	78 (51.0)	154 (47%)

In June 1987 two-thirds of those persons in medium income households were willing to take a cut in pay while working fewer hours, but this declined by March 1988 to one-half (48%), only slightly higher than for the low and high income households (45%) -- though support had come up for low income, and come down for high income.

11. Increase Immigration to Fill Vacant Jobs?

Two questions on immigration were positioned later in the list of questions (June 1987), but are reported here because the federal government places immigration with employment in one department, and one of the major purposes of current immigration policy is to meet labour market demands.

First, respondents were asked:

> "Do you think Canada should accept more or fewer immigrants than the 125,000 expected this year?"

TABLE 28
MORE OR FEWER IMMIGRANTS?

	JUNE87	
More.....	219	(23%)
Same.....	195	(21%)
Fewer.....	524	(56%)
With opinion	938	(100%)

Just over one-half of the sample (56%) felt Canada should accept fewer immigrants than the 125,000 persons expected in 1987, with less than half as many (23%) saying "more".

Second, interviewees were asked:

"What should be the first priority in our immigration policy: to reunite families, to provide asylum to political refugees, or to fill vacant jobs?"

TABLE 29
FIRST PRIORITY FOR IMMIGRATION POLICY

	JUNE87	
Reunite families.....	468	(54%)
Political asylum.....	167	(19%)
Fill vacant jobs.....	237	(27%)
With opinion	872	(100%)

The first priority for immigration policy was identified as the reunification of families, with one-half (54%) specifying this as their first choice. The filling of vacant jobs was a distant second, with 1-in-4 (27%) choosing this as their first choice.

TABLE 30

IMMIGRATION -- Responses By Region
(percentages in parenthesis)

	RESPONSE JUNE87			
REGION	MORE	SAME	FEWER	TOTAL
Atlantic	17 (21.2)	13 (16.3)	50 (62.5)	90 (100)
Quebec	51 (20.8)	62 (25.3)	132 (53.9)	245 (100)
Ontario	85 (25.3)	77 (22.8)	175 (51.9)	337 (100)
Prairies/NWT	45 (27.1)	25 (15.1)	96 (57.8)	166 (100)
B.C./Yukon	22 (19.8)	18 (16.2)	71 (64.0)	111 (100)
Canada	220 (23.4)	195 (20.8)	524 (55.8)	939 (100)

Analysis:

Of the people who expressed an opinion, the majority favored a decrease and said "fewer". Across the country, the proportion responding "fewer" were as in the following:

B.C. and Yukon	64.0%
Atlantic	62.5%
Prairies and N.W.T.	57.8%
Quebec	53.9%
Ontario	51.9%

Findings according to income: the highest number of respondents (63.3%) favouring "fewer" had an income of $10,000 or less (annually).

Findings according to level of education: 173/269 or 64.3% of those with a high school education answered "fewer".

Findings according to sex: males were slightly more favourable towards immigration by 26.2% compared to females at 17.6%. Female respondents voiced a stronger opinion with 288 out of 507 stating that "fewer" immigrants be accepted, a total of 56.8% while 236 males out of a total of 497 or 47.5% said "fewer".

Responses by age: in the youngest group, 100/179 or 56% said "fewer", similarly, in the over 65 year group, 76 out of 132 or 58% did so.

The following Table represents regional responses regarding the primary purpose of immigration policy...

TABLE 31

IMMIGRATION POLICY -- Responses By Region
(percentages in parenthesis)

RESPONSE JUNE87

REGION	REUNITE FAMILIES	POLITICAL ASYLUM	FILL THE JOBS	TOTAL
Atlantic	42 (55.2)	22 (28.9)	12 (15.9)	76 (100)
Quebec	108 (49.0)	29 (13.2)	83 (37.8)	220 (100)
Ontario	184 (59.7)	50 (16.3)	74 (24.0)	308 (100)
Prairies/NWT	86 (53.1)	33 (20.4)	43 (26.5)	162 (100)
B.C./Yukon	48 (45.3)	33 (31.1)	25 (23.6)	106 (100)
Canada	468 (53.7)	167 (19.1)	237 (27.2)	872 (100)

Out of the 872 respondents, 53.7% prefered reunion of the families, 27.2% the necessity of filling vacant jobs, while 19.1% thought providing asylum to political refugees should be the first priority.

Geographically, regarding reunification of families, Ontario was on the higher side (59.7%) with a considerable percentage (14.4%) of non-respondents, while B.C. (45.3%) and Quebec (49.0%) were on the lower side.

Out of 468 respondents who supported reunion of families, 51 per cent thought Canada should accept fewer immigrants than the 125,000 expected this year. Of the 237 respondents who preferred to fill the vacant jobs, 57 per cent believed Canada should accept fewer immigrants. And of the 131 who did not express any priority, 59 per cent thought Canada should accept fewer immigrants.

12. Increase Work Adjustment Training Opportunities?

Believing that governments are going to have to fight future unemployment through preventative work adjustment training programs, we asked:

> "In the next five to ten years, will you need to increase your level of schooling, or improve your work skills?"

TABLE 32
NEED JOB TRAINING IN FUTURE?

	MARCH88
Yes.....	549 (57%)
No.....	423 (44%)
With opinion	972 (101%)

Just more than one-half of the sample responding (and almost all did) identified a future need of more schooling, and/or training.

Analysis:
Of the 549 (57%) who said they would need to increase their level of schooling, or improve work skills in the next five to ten years, they were likely to be:

youth (81% favoured more schooling or work skills) or 25-44-year-olds (74%)

single (75%)

households with children under 12 years (74%) or 12-17-year-olds (65% support), and larger households (69%)

from households with medium incomes (63%)

with post-secondary or college/university education (62%)

13. High Rating of Schooling/Training?

To assess how important interviewees felt about the role of student or trainee, we asked:

"Please rate on a scale from 1 to 10, where 1 is low and 10 is high, how important schooling and training are to you over your lifetime?"

TABLE 33
IMPORTANCE OF SCHOOLING/TRAINING

	MARCH87
LOW (0-3)	18 (2%)
MEDIUM (4-7)	191 (19%)
HIGH (8-10)	776 (79%)
With opinion	985 (101%)

4-in-5 (79%) gave a high rating to schooling and training over their lifetime.

Analysis:
As compared to the 79% high rating of all respondents, those more likely to give a high rating to schooling and training were:

persons born outside of Canada (87%)

college/university graduates (86% in favour)

persons from Ontario (86%)

youth (85%)

from medium size cities of 100,000 - 499,999 (85%)

14. Free Trade Will Improve Job Prospects?

The question was:

"If a free trade agreement between the USA and Canada is realized, would your job prospects improve, remain the same, or worsen?"

TABLE 34

FREE TRADE WILL IMPROVE JOB PROSPECTS?

	MARCH88
WORSEN JOB PROSPECTS	147 (18%)
REMAIN THE SAME	418 (52%)
IMPROVE JOB PROSPECTS	246 (30%)
With opinion	811 (100%)

Only 4-in-5 answered the question on free trade. Of the 811 who did assess whether their job prospects would worsen, remain the same, or improve, one-half thought they would "remain the same". Almost one-fifth (18%) believed their job prospects would worsen, and one-third (30%) that they would improve because of free trade.

Analysis:
Of the 246 (30%) who thought their job prospects would improve, they were likely to be:

men (38%), not women (22%)

more highly educated, not elementary school only (19%)
from Quebec (43%) or Prairies (36%), not Ontario (20%)
born outside of Canada (35%)

in households with teenage children (38%)

15. Raise the Minimum Wage in your Province?

Governments and business/industry take the position that a lower minimum wage is an incentive to private entrepreneurs to establish new businesses and create jobs. Does the Canadian public agree with the level that has been set as a consequence of such a policy? Who would like to see it increased?

The questions posed was:

"In your province, the minimum wage is $ ____ per hour. What do you believe should be the minimum hourly wage?"

TABLE 35

HIGHER THAN THE PROVINCIAL MINIMUM WAGE
(in descending order of support for "higher")

	MARCH88		min.wage
Nova Scotia.....	34	(96%)	$4.00
British Columbia	91	(95%)	4.00
Newfoundland....	20	(87%)	4.25
Alberta.....	76	(84%)	3.80
Quebec.....	187	(83%)	4.55
Ontario.....	250	(69%)	4.55
New Brunswick...	20	(69%)	4.00
Saskatchewan....	29	(66%)	4.50
Manitoba.....	25	(54%)	4.70

[1 response from PEI, and the Yukon Territory]

Respondents from Nova Scotia (96%) and British Columbia (95%) were almost unanimous in support for a higher minimum wage in their provinces. Newfoundland (87%), Alberta (84%) and Quebec (83%) were only slightly less supportive. Two-thirds of interviewees from Ontario (69%), New Brunswick (69%) and Saskatchewan (66%) wanted a higher minimum wage, with Manitobans (54%) least in support of raising it.

Manitoba had the highest minimum wage at the time of the poll ($4.70) which explains their being lowest in support of raising the minimum wage. But such a comparison does not explain why Albertans and New Brunswickers with the lowest minimum wage did not give more support to raising it.

Analysis:
Of the 619 (78%) persons from Quebec, Ontario, Saskatchewan and Manitoba (with a minimum wage at or above $4.50/hour) who wanted the provincial minimum wage increased, they were likely to be:

from low income households (under $10,000/yr. 93% support, $10-20,000 85% support)

from Quebec (93%) or Ontario (88%)

with less than high school education (84%)

[For a summary on the above fifteen ways to fight unemployment please see the executive summary for those which have majority support, or see Table 5 for the list of all fifteen]

DETAILED FINDINGS

SECTION II: INCOME SECURITY

This second section addresses the Council's second program priority: income security. The income security aspect of "Work and Income in the Nineties" is explored in questions that ask:

1. Supplement wages of the working poor?
2. Increase support for major national social programs?
3. Guarantee annual incomes?
4. Lower pensionable age?
5. Lower pension benefits at a younger age?
6. Approve tax reforms of June 1987?

They answered, from most to least favourable (giving priority to most recent poll/March 1988):

TABLE 36
OPINIONS ON INCOME SECURITY -- FROM MOST TO LEAST FAVOURABLE

IN FAVOUR /BELIEVE of... that...	JUN87	MAR88
establish a Guaranteed Annual Income	78%	76%
increase Old Age Security	74%	--
increase the Guaranteed Income Supplement	72%	--
supplement the wages of the working poor	64%	69%
worker acceptance of lower early pension	69%	--
lower the pensionable age below 65 years	68%	64%
increase benefits from Canada/Quebec Pension Plan	59%	--
increase Veteran's Allowance	54%	--
increase Family Allowance	47%	--
believe tax reforms of June 1987 will worsen their financial situation	41%	--
increase welfare benefits	39%	--

increase Worker's Compensation	32%	--
increase Unemployment Insurance Benefits	26%	--

1. Supplement Wages of the Working Poor?

Public support for wage supplementation was sought by the question:

> "Do you think that governments should supplement the wages of the working poor?"

TABLE 37
SUPPLEMENT WAGES OF WORKING POOR?

	JUNE87		MARCH88	
Yes.....	605	(64%)	642	(69%)
No.....	342	(36%)	284	(31%)
With opinion	947	(100%)	926	(100%)

This data reveals two-thirds (64% in June 1987; 69% in March 1988) of Canadians support the idea of supplementing the wages of the working poor, a policy which only a few provinces have instituted. A slight increase in support of five percentage points over a nine month period should be noted.

TABLE 38

SUPPLEMENTING WAGES OF WORKING POOR -- Responses by Region
(percentages in parenthesis)

RESPONSE JUNE87

REGION	Yes		No		Total	
Atlantic	54	(61.4)	34	(38.6)	88	(100)
Quebec	179	(74.6)	61	(25.4)	240	(100)
Ontario	213	(62.6)	127	(37.4)	340	(100)
Prairies/NWT	106	(62.7)	63	(37.3)	169	(100)
B.C./Yukon	54	(48.6)	57	(51.4)	111	(100)
Canada	606	(63.9)	342	(36.1)	948	(100)

Analysis:
A substantial majority of Canadians (63.9%) in June 1987 felt that the government should supplement the wages of the working poor, with B.C./Yukon, least in favour (48.6%).

In Quebec, the highest "yes" response may have been influenced by previous Parti-Quebecoise policies , which for 8 or 9 years had implemented a wage supplementation program. Quebec has had, as far back as 1971, the highest distribution of low income families in all of Canada (Social Statistics, 1977, Perspective Canada).

Statistically, where two-thirds of Canadians polled favoured supplementing the wages of the working poor, three-quarters also favoured a guaranteed annual income that would put all Canadians above the poverty line.

Of the 642 (69%) respondents in March 1988 who favoured wage supplementation, they were likely to be:

from large families (82% support)

low income households (less than $20,000/yr. 82%)

less than high school education (81%)

youth (79%)

from Quebec (77%)

separated/divorced/widowed (75%)

with children under 12 years of age (75%)

2. Increase Support for Major National Social Programs?

Support for major national social programs was explored with this question:

> "I am now going to list eight government programs by which financial benefits are provided to Canadians. Would you please say whether the amount of money in each program should be increased, remain the same, or be decreased?"

Support for the programs, ranging from most to least support (of those expressing an opinion), is presented here in terms of benefits needing to be increased:

TABLE 39
INCREASED SUPPORT FOR SOCIAL PROGRAMS

amount of money
should be increased

	JUNE87	
Old Age Security.....	681	(74.0)
Guaranteed Income Supplement...	631	(72.1)
Canada/Quebec Pension Plan.....	522	(59.1)
Veteran's Allowance.....	407	(54.3)
Family Allowances.....	426	(47.3)
Welfare.....	337	(38.5)
Worker's Compensation.....	264	(32.3)
Unemployment Insurance.....	242	(26.4)

This Table indicates a majority of Canadians favoured additional monies for programs that relate to the elderly (OAS: 74%, GIS: 72%, CPP/QPP: 59%, and VA: 54%). At the opposite end of the age continuum, almost one-half wanted more money given to families with young children (FA: 47.3%). Programs for workers / non-workers secured the least support (Welfare: 39%, Worker's Compensation: 32%, UI: 26%).

TABLE 40

GOVERNMENTAL FINANCIAL BENEFITS -- Responses by Age
(percentages)

RESPONSE JUNE87: Increase

AGE	Welf	UI	FA	OAS	GIS	CPP	WC	VA
18-24	41.1	30.2	58.4	74.7	70.6	58.7	32.5	51.0
25-44	39.4	28.3	50.8	80.3	73.3	63.5	28.1	51.8
45-64	39.1	23.7	41.9	73.0	73.5	57.8	35.4	56.9
65 +	30.2	19.6	28.8	54.8	67.5	48.3	43.9	59.3
Canada	875	916	902	922	875	883	817	750

The majority of respondents felt the above benefits should remain the same or be increased. The percentage who prefer to decrease benefits is small, especially for Old Age Security (less than 3% of respondents).

The younger respondents (18-24 and 25-44) were more in favour of increases to programs from which they might benefit, namely, welfare benefits, unemployment insurance and family allowance. For example, 50.8% of respondents in the child rearing age of 25-44 years old believed family allowances should be increased.

All age groups favoured increasing the following benefits for the elderly: old age security, guaranteed income supplement for seniors, Canada (or Quebec) pension plan. However, the younger respondents were more in favour of increasing these benefits than the actual recipients (80.3% of 25-44 group to 54.8% of those 65 and over)! This suggests senior citizens are more satisfied with their benefits than others would assume.

A higher percentage of respondents across all age groups felt welfare benefits, unemployment insurance and worker's compensation should remain the same.

TABLE 41

WELFARE, UI & FAMILY ALLOWANCE -- INCREASE, SAME, DECREASE?

Responses by Region (for those who expressed an opinion)
Increase, Same (by percentage)

RESPONSE JUNE87

REGION	Welfare		Unemployment		Family Allow	
	Inc.	Same	Inc.	Same	Inc.	Same
Atlantic	52.0	33.3	40.9	44.6	46.4	47.7
Quebec	49.8	38.7	28.8	62.2	71.8	24.4
Ontario	29.3	45.3	24.2	54.9	41.0	48.1
Prairies	29.8	47.7	18.3	65.1	31.3	54.6
B.C.& Yukon	43.0	38.3	29.5	57.2	35.8	48.1

Atlantic, Quebec and B.C.(Yukon) had a substantially higher percentage of respondents who wanted to increase welfare benefits. Ontario and Prairie respondents were more satisfied with benefits as they were.

Concerning unemployment insurance, Atlantic Canada was noticeably more willing to increase benefits, possibly reflecting the high unemployment rate in this region. The majority of respondents in other regions were content with the program.

Of the 238 Quebec respondents (majority French speaking) 71.8% advocated an increase in family allowance benefits. This is almost twice the number as from other regions where respondents are predominantly English speaking. Family allowance benefits are payable to women and for many women their only source of income. Income levels in Quebec are lower than other regions with fewer women employed outside the home.

3. Guarantee Annual Incomes?

Public support for a guaranteed annual income was tested by the question:

> "Would you be in favour of a single program, namely a guaranteed annual income, that would put all Canadians above the poverty line?"

TABLE 42
FAVOUR A GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME?

	JUNE87	MARCH88
Yes.....	749 (78%)	719 (76%)
No.....	214 (22%)	232 (24%)
With opinion	963 (100%)	660 (100%)

A high level of support for a single financial support program was registered, as three quarters (78% in June 1987; 76% in March 1988) of those expressing an opinion said they were in favour, in both polls, of a guaranteed annual income (GAI) that would put all Canadians above the poverty line.

The following table reveals the responses of Canadians with opinions, analyzed by Region.

TABLE 43

GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME -- Responses By Region
(percentages in parenthesis)

RESPONSE JUNE87

REGION	Yes	No	Total
Atlantic	74 (85.1)	13 (14.9)	87 (100)
Quebec	208 (83.5)	41 (16.5)	249 (100)
Ontario	256 (74.2)	89 (25.8)	345 (100)
Prairies/NWT	133 (77.3)	39 (22.6)	172 (100)
B.C./Yukon	78 (70.9)	32 (29.1)	110 (100)
Canada	749 (77.8)	214 (22.2)	963 (100)

(N = 963 -- respondents with an opinion; 96% of those polled.)

Analysis:
Three-quarters of Canadians who expressed an opinion favoured a single program, namely a guaranteed annual income which would put all Canadians above the poverty line.

Despite a gradual decrease of support for a G.A.I. as household income rises, this idea has widespread support among Canadians of all backgrounds, strata and regions.

Regional differences vary from the national average of 77.8% by no more than seven percentage points from Atlantic (high) to B.C./Yukon (low).

As well, 84% of those who said "yes" to supplementing the wages of the working poor said "yes" to a Guaranteed Annual Income. In addition, even 56% of those who said "no" to supplementing wages (as well as 77% of those who did not have a definite opinion about the wages of the working poor), were in favour of a GAI.

Analysis:
Of the 719 (76%) respondents who favoured a GAI, they were likely to be:

from low income households (under $20,000/yr. 87% support)

with less than high school education (87%)

from the Atlantic region (87%) or Quebec (85%)

from areas of less than 10,000 population (84%)

separated/divorced/widowed (84%)

youth (82%)

4. Lower the Pensionable Age?

The issue of a pensionable age, other than 65 years, was examined by two questions, the first as to when pension benefits should become available, and the second as to whether the respondent would be willing to take early retirement with a reduced rate of pension. The questions posed were:

> "Old Age Security is currently available at age 65. At what age do you think full governmental and other pension benefits should become available?"

TABLE 44
WHEN SHOULD PENSION BENEFITS START?

	JUNE87		MARCH88	
Under 55 years.....	45	(5%)	43	(4%)
55 - 59.....	150	(16%)	115	(12%)
60 - 64.....	452	(47%)	463	(48%)
65.....	307	(32%)	335	(34%)
66 years or more...	14	(1%)	17	(2%)
With opinion.....	968	(100.1%)	973	(100%)

Almost all of the national representative sample answered this question, with one-half specifying 60-64 years of age as the time when pension benefits should start (47% support in June 1987, 48% in March 1988).

TABLE 45

OLD AGE SECURITY -- Responses By Region
(percentages in parenthesis)

RESPONSE JUNE87

REGION	UNDER 60	60-64	65 AND OVER	TOTAL
Atlantic	16 (17.6)	47 (51.6)	28 (30.1)	91 (100)
Ontario	58 (17.0)	153 (44.9)	130 (38.1)	341 (100)

Prairies/NWT	26 (14.9)	69 (39.4)	80 (45.7)	175 (100)
Quebec	76 (29.9)	143 (56.3)	35 (13.8)	254 (100)
BC/YUKON	19 (17.1)	40 (36.3)	52 (46.8)	111 (100)
CANADA	195 (20.1)	452 (46.5)	325 (33.4)	972 (100)

Of the 972 respondents expressing an opinion on Old Age Security nearly one-half (46.5%) favoured age 60-64. One-third (33%) said it should remain at age 65 and one-fifth (20%) favoured 55-59.

Of those who favoured early retirement, 68% said they would take a reduced rate of pension, while over one-fourth (29%) would not. The national figure of 46.5% represents the proportion of respondents who favoured early retirement 60-64. By geographical regions, Quebec was on the higher side (56%) compared to British Columbia on the lower side (36%).

Analysis:
Of the 463 (48%) respondents favouring 60-64 years in March 1988, they were likely to be:

from households of less than $10,000/yr. incomes (56%) or in the $40-50,000 range (55%)

from Quebec (56%)

with an elementary school education (54% support)

45-64 years of age (53%) -- who would be the first recipients of a lowered pensionable age.

5. Lower Pension Benefits at a Younger Age?

"If you held a paid job and wanted to take early retirement, would you be willing to take a reduced rate of pension?"

TABLE 46
TAKE A REDUCED RATE OF PENSION?

	JUNE87	
Yes.....	668	(69%)
No.....	296	(31%)
With opinion	964	(100%)

When asked whether they would be willing to take a reduced rate of pension if they retired at a younger age (than when full pension benefits would normally become available), seven-in-ten (69%) said "yes".

TABLE 47

LOWER PENSION AT A YOUNGER AGE -- Responses by Region
(percentages in parenthesis)

	RESPONSES JUNE87		
EDUCATION	Yes	No	Total
Elementary	52 (57.1)	39 (42.9)	91 (100)
High School	268 (66.7)	134 (33.3)	402 (100)
Post Secondary	343 (73.9)	121 (26.1)	464 (100)
Total	663 (69.3)	294 (30.7)	957 (100)

Viewed according to education, the data revealed a positive relationship between the level of education and affirmative responses to the question.

TABLE 48
LOWER PENSION AT A YOUNGER AGE -- Responses by Income
(percentages in parenthesis)

	RESPONSE JUNE87		
HOUSEHOLD INCOME	Yes	No	Total
Under $10.000	60 (60.6)	39 (39.4)	99 (100)
10,000 - 20,000	106 (63.5)	61 (36.5)	167 (100)
In the 20,000's	119 (74.8)	40 (25.2)	159 (100)
In the 30,000's	111 (71.2)	45 (28.8)	156 (100)
In the 40,000's	81 (74.3)	28 (25.7)	109 (100)
In the 50,000's	55 (66.3)	28 (33.7)	83 (100)
$60,000 & over	96 (80.7)	23 (19.3)	119 (100)
Total	628 (70.4)	264 (29.6)	892 (100)

Viewed according to income, those least likely to take early retirement with reduced pension rates were in the lower income bracket with a household income of less than $10,000 per annum. Those most in favour were in the upper income bracket with household incomes above $60,000 per annum.

The above findings indicate a direct link between level of financial security and willingness to take early retirement with reduced benefits.

In reviewing the responses to Question 16 together with responses to Question 15 consideration was given as to whether or not those advocating earlier retirement with full benefits would also be prepared to take early retirement at a reduced rate of pension. This provides some perspective on possible trade-offs involving a reduced pension sooner rather than full benefits later. It was found that of the 647 respondents who were in favour of reducing the pensionable age to below 65, 416 (64%) indicated they themselves would be willing to take a reduced pension if they took early retirement.

There was very little disparity in responses by region, age, sex, marital status or language.

6. Approve Tax Reforms Introduced June 1987?

Our telephone interviewees were asked their views on the federal Finance Minister's very recent tax reform proposals:

> "The federal finance minister has just proposed various tax reform measures. If these tax measures are brought in, will your financial situation be better, the same or worse?"

TABLE 49

TAX REFORMS BETTER OR WORSEN YOUR FINANCIAL SITUATION?

	JUNE87	
Better.....	127	(15.1)
Same.....	369	(44.0)
Worse.....	343	(40.9)
With opinion	839	(100.0)

Canadians appeared less pleased with tax reform than with the constitutional accord. Only 1-in-7 (versus 1-in-3) expressed the view that their financial situation would be better as a result of the tax reform proposals, while a similar 2-in-5 (40.9%) thought the proposals would make things worse (in June 1987).

Table 50 presents the opinions (i.e., financial situation will be "better", the "same" or "worse") of the national and representative sample by sex and region.

TABLE 50

FINANCIAL IMPACT OF TAX REFORM -- Responses By Sex and Region
(percentages in parenthesis)

		RESPONSE JUNE87		
REGION	**SEX**	**BETTER**	**SAME**	**WORSE**
Atlantic	Male	11 (33.3)	12 (36.4)	10 (30.3)
	Female	8 (18.2)	21 (47.7)	15 (34.1)
Quebec	Male	23 (19.3)	64 (53.8)	32 (26.9)
	Female	18 (19.8)	52 (57.1)	21 (23.1)
Ontario	Male	27 (16.5)	63 (38.4)	74 (45.1)
	Female	16 (12.1)	62 (47.0)	54 (40.9)
Prairies/NWT	Male	10 (11.5)	33 (37.9)	44 (50.6)
	Female	5 (6.9)	28 (38.9)	39 (54.2)
B.C./Yukon	Male	5 (11.4)	16 (36.4)	23 (52.3)
	Female	5 (9.4)	17 (32.1)	31 (58.5)
CANADA				
N=347	Male	76 (21.9)	188 (54.2)	83 (23.9)
N=392	Female	51 (13.0)	181 (46.2)	160 (40.8)

The Tax Reform proposals of Finance Minister Michael Wilson were designed to assist women (given the feminization of poverty) and those living in the "have not" regions of Canada. This study shows that few women or men, or persons from any of the five regions believe their financial situation will be better as a result of tax changes (ranging from 9 to 20% -- with one exception).

Both women and men generally thought that their economic standard of living would stay the same or get worse. It is interesting to note, however, that in Quebec 54% of the men thought there would be no change in their economic status; this contrasts with percentages in the mid-thirties for the other four regions.

TABLE 51

TAX REFORM & MEECH LAKE ACCORD -- Responses the same
(percentages in parenthesis)

BETTER	SAME	WORSE	NO OPINION	TOTAL
42	61	140	115	358
(4.2)	(6.1)	(13.9)	(11.4)	(35.6)

Only 35.6 per cent of respondents voted the same way on the two questions. This is an indication that people were responding on the basis of what they thought of the government initiatives, rather than simply giving an impulse reaction about government. There was little positive reaction, however, toward either proposal.

[For a summary of public support for increases in income security please see the executive summary for those gaining support from a majority of Canadians, or see Table 36 for the full listing]

DETAILED FINDINGS

SECTION III: SOCIAL SERVICES

Opinions were solicited about personal social services on the issues of day care, home support, family violence, self-help or mutual aid, young offenders, and parenting. We asked:

1. Provide more day care subsidies?
2. Make day care fully accessible?
3. Set standards for quality day care?
4. Need home support services? Satisfied with service provided?
5. More help to victims of family violence?
6. Know an abused elder?
7. Has charging batterers helped abused women?
8. Member of a self-help / mutual aid group?
9. Support group home for young offenders?
10. Support community alternatives to prison?
11. Valuation of parenting role.
12. Will the Meech Lake Accord improve or worsen social programs?

The level of support from most to least favourable is summarized in Table 52.

TABLE 52

OPINIONS ON SOCIAL SERVICES -- FROM MOST TO LEAST FAVOURABLE

IN FAVOUR /BELIEVE	of... that...	JUNE87	MARCH88
set standards for quality day care		95%	--
more money into transition home and counselling services for victims of family violence		91%	--
rate parenting 8-10 points on a max. scale of 10		--	81%
charging of batterers has helped abused women		--	79%
support introduction of a small group home for young offenders in their neighbourhood		--	77%
support community-based counselling and community service programs for offenders		--	75%
make day care free (either to some, or all)		75%	--

more subsidy dollars for licenced day care	67%	--
Meech Lake Accord will worsen social programs	46%	--
improve quality and availability of home support	41%	--
rate volunteering 8-10 points on max. scale of 10	--	36%
personally know an abused elder	--	13%
of households house a self-help group member	--	7%

1. Provide More Day Care Subsidies?

Support for universal, publicly funded quality day care was probed by three questions. The first question being:

> "I would like to ask several questions about day care. Should governments put more money into subsidizing licenced day care costs?"

TABLE 53
MORE DAY CARE SUBSIDIES?

	JUNE87
Yes.....	617 (67%)
No.....	298 (33%)
With opinion	915 (100%)

Two-thirds of those expressing a view stated governments should put more money into subsidizing licenced day care costs. But twice the proportion of respondents felt licenced day care should be "free to some" (50.3%), rather than "free to all" -- though the combination wanting one or the other was very strong (75.4%).

The following Table presents the data, by age and sex.

TABLE 54

SUBSIDIZED LICENCED DAY CARE - Responses by Age and Sex
(percentages in parenthesis)

RESPONSE JUNE87

	YES		NO		TOTAL	
AGE	F	M	F	M	F	M
18-24	72(84.7)	57(68.7)	13(15.3)	26(31.3)	85(100)	83(100)
25-44	157(81.3)	137(65.9)	36(18.7)	71(34.1)	193(100)	208(100)
45-64	75(64.7)	61(50.8)	41(35.3)	59(49.2)	116(100)	120(100)
65+	35(57.4)	23(46.9)	26(42.6)	26(53.1)	61(100)	49(100)
TOTAL	339(74.5)	278(60.4)	116(25.5)	182(39.6)	455(100)	460(100)

Analysis:
The highest number of the supporters of subsidized licenced day care is represented by women in the age range 18-24 (84.7%), followed by women in the age range 25-44 (81.3%). Men in the same age range are also in favour of subsidized licenced day care (68.7% and 65.9%).

The data suggests those who support licenced subsidized day care:

- have two children under 12 years of age	80.6%
speak French	79.6%
live in the Prairies/NWT	79.2%
are single/never married	76.9%
have an income under $10,000 per year	76.5%
live in a three person household	74.2%
live in a large city	70.2%

The lowest and the highest education level are most often represented in the group saying "yes".

We see that one-half of persons answering "yes" to subsidized licenced day care also believe that day care should be "free to some" (55.7%), while one-quarter think it should be "free to all" (27.6%).

2. Make Day Care Fully Accessible?

The next question asked:

> "Should licenced day care be free to all, free to some, or free to none?"

TABLE 55
UNIVERSAL DAY CARE?

	JUNE87	
Free to all.....	240	(25%)
Free to some....	482	(50%)
Free to none....	236	(25%)
With opinion....	958	(100%)

TABLE 56

UNIVERSALITY/SELECTIVITY FOR DAY CARE --Responses by Income
(percentages in parenthesis)

	RESPONSE JUNE87			
INCOME	**FREE TO ALL**	**FREE TO SOME**	**FREE TO NONE**	**TOTAL**
Under $20,000	90 (33.8)	124 (46.6)	52 (19.5)	266 (100)
Under $50,000	103 (24.2)	219 (51.5)	103 (24.2)	425 (100)
Over $50,000	47 (17.6)	139 (52.1)	81 (30.3)	267 (100)
Total	240 (25.1)	482 (50.3)	236 (24.6)	958 (100)

Analysis:
One half (50.3%) of those who expressed an opinion believed day care should be "free to some"; that is, according to their income or need. The survey also shows that respondents with an income over $50,000/year (17.6%) are most against the concept of day care being "free to all".

Of 952 respondents who expressed an opinion, 47.9% felt that day care should be "free to some", even those with no children (49.5%); with Quebec reporting the highest support (55.0%) and the Prairies the lowest (42.2%).

3. Set Standards for Quality Day Care?

And the third and final question on day care asked:

> "Do you believe governments should set standards to ensure quality of day care for young children?"

TABLE 57
DAY CARE STANDARDS

	JUNE87
Yes.....	938 (95%)
No.....	46 (5%)
With opinion	984 (100%)

The following table presents, on a regional basis, the views of Canadians who believed governments should set standards to ensure quality of day care for young children.

TABLE 58

STANDARDS FOR DAY CARE -- Responses by Region

RESPONSE JUNE87

REGION	YES	NO	TOTAL
Atlantic	85 (94.44)	5 (5.56)	90 (100)
Ontario	325 (93.12)	24 (6.88)	349 (100)
Quebec	246 (96.47)	9 (3.53)	255 (100)
Prairies/NWT	170 (97.14)	5 (2.86)	175 (100)
B.C./Yukon	112 (97.39)	3 (2.61)	115 (100)
CANADA	938 (95.33)	46 (4.67)	984 (100)

Analysis:
Regional variation is so small that it can be concluded almost all Canadians expect governments to set standards for quality of day care.

Of the 4.7% of Canadians opposed, the majority...
--did not have any children under 12 years of age,
--indicated that governments should not subsidize day care,
--thought day care should not be "free to all".

4. Need Home Support Services?

In Poll #1 the next question in the section on social services concerned home support services. If such a service was being used, then the follow-up question assessed their satisfaction with it.

> "Does anyone in your household require support services, such as home care, visiting nurses, meals on wheels?"

TABLE 59
NEED HOME SUPPORT SERVICE?

	JUNE87	
Yes.....	69	(7%)
No.....	931	(93%)
With opinion	1000	(100%)

If "yes":
"Are you satisfied with the quality and availability of these services?"

TABLE 60
HOME SUPPORT SATISFACTION

	JUNE87	
Yes / satisfied.....	41	(59%)
No / not satisfied...	28	(41%)
With opinion.....	69	(100%)

Seven per cent (7%) of the households participating in the opinion poll had a member requiring home care, visiting nurses, meals on wheels, or some other such support service. Of the 69 households requiring home support services, only three-fifths (59%) were satisfied with the quality and availability of these services. In Poll #2 a different question was asked, namely,

> "Is there someone in your household who requires a home support service and is not receiving it?"

TABLE 61
NOT RECEIVING HOME SUPPORT SERVICE?

	MARCH88
Yes, not receiving needed service...	24 (2.4%)

Of the 996 respondents, 24 (2.4%) stated there was someone in the household who required a home support service and was not receiving it.

Of the 24 individuals specifying an unmet need for home support services we then asked:

"What service is not being received?

Twenty interviewees were able to identify the service needed--but not provided -- and homemaker services was the largest unmet need (8 households) by far, followed by assistance for a disabled person (4 households), and then transportation (2) and "Meals on Wheels" (2).

Analysis:
Of the 24 (2.4%) of the respondents who identified an unmet need for home support services, they might more likely be (a cautionary note on the very small number being reported on here):

from low income households

in Quebec

with elementary school education

rural dwellers

separated/divorced/widowed

TABLE 62

HOME SUPPORT SERVICES -- Responses By Region
(percentages in parenthesis)

	RESPONSE JUNE87		
REGION	Yes	No	Total
Atlantic	7 (7.7)	84 (92.3)	91 (100)
Quebec	31 (12.1)	226 (87.9)	257 (100)

Ontario	16 (4.5)	341 (95.5)	357 (100)
Prairies/NWT	8 (4.4)	172 (95.6)	180 (100)
B.C./Yukon	7 (6.1)	108 (93.9)	115 (100)
Canada	69 (6.9)	931 (92.5)	1000 (100)

A very low percentage of Canadians use support services (Quebec being the biggest user at 12%, while Prairies/NWT and Ontario, the least at 4.4% and 4.5%, respectively).

Q21 (If "yes" to question 20)
"Are you satisfied with the quality and availability of these services?"

Of the 69 respondents (or other household member) who use support services, 41 (59.4%) were satisfied, while 28 (40.6%) were dissatisfied. The least satisfied were from the Atlantic region (28.6%), and the most satisfied from the Prairies/NWT (100%). But valid conclusions cannot be achieved due to small numbers of respondents in all regions.

5. More Help to Victims of Family Violence?

The matter of financial support to help victims of family violence was addressed with the question:

> "Should governments put more money into transition homes and counselling services to help victims of family violence?"

TABLE 63
MORE MONEY TO HELP CRIME VICTIMS?

	JUNE87
Yes.....	875 (91%)
No.....	86 (9%)
With opinion	961 (100%)

Analysis:
According to the results, shown in the above tables, the vast majority (91%) of respondents, represented both by region and language, are in favour of governments paying for services to help victims of family violence. This remains consistent when analyzed by sex, education, and marital status.

6. Know an Abused Elder?

In Poll #2 (March 1988) questions were posed about elder abuse and wife battering. The question on the former was phrased:

"Do you personally know an elderly person who has been physically or emotionally abused?"

TABLE 64
KNOW AN ABUSED ELDER?

	MARCH88
Yes.....	124 (13%)
No.....	869 (88%)
With opinion	993 (100%)

More than 1-in-10 (13%) of the national sample personally knew an elderly person who had been physically or emotionally abused.

Analysis:
Of the 124 (12%) respondents who personally knew an abused elder, they were likely to be:

- from households with 2 or 3 teenagers (23% personal knowledge)
- from household of less than $10,000/yr. (22% personal knowledge), or more than $70,000/yr. (21%)
- from Saskatchewan (21%)
- divorced (20%)
- in a professional or clerical job (20%)

7. Charging Batterers Has Helped Abused Women?

As for the question on wife battering, we asked:

"The police are encouraged to lay a charge of assault against men who batter their wives. Do you think this policy has helped battered women?

TABLE 65
CHARGING BATTERERS HAS HELPED ABUSED WIVES?

	MARCH88
Yes, has helped.....	689 (79%)
No, has not helped..	179 (21%)
With opinion	868 (100%)

Of the 868 (87%) persons responding, 4-in-5 (79%) felt the laying of a charge of assault against men who batter their wives has helped battered women.

Analysis:
Of the 689 (79%) who think charging batterers has helped battered women, they were likely to be:

single person households (87% believing "has helped")

with elementary school education (85%)

with household incomes $30-40,000 (85%)

8. Member of a Self-Help / Mutual Aid Group?

Two questions were posed in June 1987 about self-help or mutual aid groups. The first question was:

> "You have probably heard of such self-help or mutual aid groups as Alcoholics Anonymous, Bereaved Parents, and Parents Without Partners. Are you now participating in a self-help group?"

Five per cent (5%) of those interviewed said they were participating in a self-help group, as revealed in this Table:

TABLE 66
IN A SELF-HELP GROUP?

	JUNE87
Yes.....	47 (4.7%)
No.....	947 (95.3%)
With opinion	994 (100.0%)

We also wanted to know whether someone else in the household might be (or also be) a member of a self-help group, and asked:

"Is a member of your household participating in a self-help group?"

TABLE 67
OTHER HOUSEHOLD MEMBER IN A SELF-HELP GROUP?

Yes.....	72	(7.2%)
No.....	927	(92.8%)
With opinion	999	(100.0%)

The percentage of other household members (7.2%) belonging to a self-help group was more than for the interviewees (4.7%). The actual percentage of households in which the respondent and/or a household member participated in a self-help group totalled twelve per cent.

TABLE 68
HOUSEHOLD MEMBER IN A SELF-HELP GROUP?

	JUNE87	MARCH88
Yes, in a self-help group...	119 (11.9%)	69 (6.9%)

The data for March 1988 is more reliable, in that the respondent then was prompted to name the self-help group, and if the reply was inappropriate, then the "yes" response to self-help membership was coded "no". Thus, it is safe to say that approximately 1-in-15 or seven per cent of households contains one or more self-help group participants.

Analysis:
Of the 69 (7%) respondents who replied "yes" for their household, they were more likely to be:

in households with annual incomes of less than $10,000 (13%)

never married individuals (12%)

youth (12%)

9. Support Group Home for Young Offenders?

Concern about the availability of group homes for young offenders throughout Canada led to our asking:

"Would you support the introduction of a small group home for young offenders in your neighbourhood?"

TABLE 69
GROUP HOME FOR YOUNG OFFENDERS?

	MARCH88
Yes.....	726 (77%)
No.....	217 (23%)
With opinion	943 (100%)

Some 3-in-4 of those responding said they would support the introduction of a small group home for young offenders in their neighbourhood.

Analysis:
Of the 726 (77%) supporting a small group home for young offenders in their neighbourhood, they were more likely to be:

from Quebec (88% support for group home), then Atlantic (82%)

household income under $20,000/year (82%)

youth (83%)

population in the area of less than 10,000 persons (82%)

10. Support Community Alternatives to Prison?

To explore the public attitude toward community alternatives to prison or jail for persons convicted of a crime, we asked:

"As an alternative to prison would you support community-based programs for offenders of all ages, such as counsel ling services, or compulsory community services?"

TABLE 70
COMMUNITY ALTERNATIVES TO PRISON?

	MARCH88
Yes.....	671 (75%)
No.....	226 (25%)
With opinion	897 (100%)

Three-in-four (75%) of respondents supported community-based programs for offenders as an alternative to prison.

Analysis:
Of the 671 (75%) of respondents supporting community-based programs for offenders, they were more likely to be:

from Quebec (83% support) or the Atlantic region (82%)

in households with teenagers present (82%)

with annual household incomes above $60,000 (80%)

45-64 years of age (80%)

11. Valuation of Parenting Role

Lastly, the exploration of values about major roles in life was done through scaling (from 1 to 10) the degree of importance assigned by the respondent to schooling/training, working, parenting and volunteering. We asked:

"Please rate on a scale from 1 to 10 -- where 1 is low and 10 is high -- how important schooling and training, working, parenting, and volunteering are to you over your lifetime...
How important is schooling/training to you on a scale from 1-10?
How important is working... is parenting... is volunteering?

TABLE 71
ROLE VALUES

MARCH88 Scale:	Schooling/Training	Working	Parenting	Volunteering
0 - 3	18 (2%)	18 (2%)	47 (5%)	73 (8%)
4 - 7	191 (19%)	149 (15%)	135 (14%)	550 (56%)
8 -10	776 (79%)	826 (83%)	784 (81%)	352 (36%)
Total:	985 (100%)	993 (100%)	966 (100%)	975 (100%)

The schooling/training and working roles are covered earlier under the employment concern. Here, we note that parenting comes a close second (81%) to working (83%) at the high end of the scale (8-10 points out-of-10), with schooling/training a close third (79%). Volunteering is a distant fourth at the high valuation end of the scale, registering only 36 per cent.

Analysis:
Of the 784 (81%) placing a high value on the role of parenting, they were more likely to be:

65 years of age or over (92% assigning a high value)

with elementary school education (91%)

with children under 12 years of age (91%)

married or formerly married (88%)

in population areas of less than 10,000 (88%)

with household incomes under $10,000/year (87%)

12. Will the Meech Lake Accord Improve/Worsen Social Programs?

The question posed in June 1987 was:

> The Prime Minister and the provincial premiers recently reached an agreement on the Constitution at Meech Lake which may affect the future of social programs in Canada. Do you think our social programs will be better or worse as a result of the Meech Lake Accord?"

TABLE 72
MEECH LAKE ACCORD WILL BETTER SOCIAL PROGRAMS?

Better.....	206	(34.7)
Same.....	117	(19.7)
Worse.....	271	(45.6)
With opinion	594	(100.0)

Four-in-ten did not answer the question. Of those who did, almost one-half (45.6%) thought social programs would be worse as a result of the Meech Lake Accord. One-third (34.7%) believed social programs would be better as a result of the constitutional Accord.

Table 73 presents the opinions on the Meech Lake Accord of the national and representative sample by the number of children under 12 years of age in the household.

TABLE 73

SOCIAL IMPACT OF MEECH LAKE ACCORD

Responses by No. of Children Under 12 Years of Age
(percentages in parenthesis)

RESPONSE JUNE87

CHILDREN	Better	Same	Worse	Total
0	126 (31.4)	82 (20.4)	193 (48.1)	401(99.9)
1	28 (31.5)	15 (16.9)	46 (51.7)	89(100.1)
2	39 (52.7)	12 (16.2)	23 (31.1)	74(100)
3 and more	13 (43.3)	8 (26.7)	9 (30.0)	30(100)
Canada	206 (34.7)	117 (19.7)	271 (45.6)	N=594(100)

Of the people who expressed their opinions on the impact of the Meech Lake Accord on social programs in Canada, one-half (52.7%) of families with two children believed social programs would be better as a result of this Accord.

For a summary of the views of a majority of the sample to the personal social services please see the executive summary, and for the full list of opinions see the summary table at the beginning of this section (Table 52).

This concludes the presentation of the findings of two opinion polls on social development which were conducted in June 1987 and March 1988 by the Canadian Council on Social Development.

For further information please contact:

Harry MacKay, Ph.D., Senior Researcher
Canadian Council on Social Development
55 Parkdale Avenue, Ottawa, Ontario
K1Y 4G1
(613) 728 - 1865

APPENDIX A

CCSD SOCIAL OPINION POLL, JUNE 1987

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

1. Well over one million Canadians are currently unemployed, with the official national unemployment rate around nine per cent. Do you think governments are doing enough to fight unemployment?

Yes.....1
No.....2
Qualified....3
No opinion...4

2. Do you think governments should give money to commercial businesses to create jobs?

Yes.....1
No.....2
Qualified....3
No opinion...4

3. Do you think governments should give money to non-profit organizations to create jobs?

Yes.....1
No.....2
Qualified....3
No opinion...4

4. For those who have been unemployed for over four months... Do you think governments should guarantee opportunities for job training?

Yes.....1
No.....2
Qualified....3
No opinion...4

5. For those who have been unemployed for over four months... Do you think governments should guarantee a job?

Yes.....1
No.....2
Qualified....3
No opinion...4

6. Do you believe governments should provide financial assistance to create jobs where the unemployed live?

Yes.....1
No.....2
Qualified....3
No opinion...4

7. Do you believe governments should provide financial assistance to move the unemployed to where the jobs are?

Yes.....1
No.....2
Qualified....3
No opinion...4

8. Part-time workers usually do not receive fringe benefits. Do you think someone who works half-time should get one-half the fringe benefits, like medical and pension coverage, that a full-time worker receives?

Yes.....1
No.....2
Qualified....3
No opinion...4

9. Do you have a job?

Yes.....1
No.....2
Qualified....3
No opinion...4

IF NO, SKIP TO #12
IF YES:

10. Would you prefer to work more, the same, or fewer hours per week, or weeks per year?

More.....1
Same.....2
Fewer.....3
Qualified....4
No opinion...5

IF FEWER:

11. If you did work less time in your paid job, would you be willing to take a cut in pay?

Yes.....1
No.....2
Qualified....3

No opinion...4

12. Do you think that governments should supplement the wages of the working poor?

Yes.....1
No.....2
Qualified....3
No opinion...4

13. I am now going to list eight government programs by which financial benefits are provided to Canadians. Would you please say whether the amount of money in each program should be increased, remain the same, or be decreased?

	+	same	-	DK
a) welfare				
b) unemployment insurance				
c) family allowances				
d) old age security				
e) guaranteed income supplement for seniors				
f) Canada (or Quebec) Pension Plan				
g) worker's compensation				
h) veteran's allowance				

14. Would you be in favour of a single program, namely a guaranteed annual income, that would put all Canadians above the poverty line?

Yes.....1
No.....2
Qualified....3
No opinion...4

15. Old Age Security is currently available at age 65. At what age do you think full government and other pension benefits should become available?

50-54.....1
55-59.....2
60-64.....3
65.....4
66+.....5
Qualified.....6
No opinion.....7

16. If you held a paid job and wanted to take early retirement, would you be willing to take a reduced rate of pension?

Yes.....1
No.....2
Qualified....3
No opinion...4

I would like to ask several questions about day care.

17. Should governments put more money into subsidizing licenced day care costs?

Yes.....1
No.....2
Qualified....3
No opinion...4

18. Should licenced day care be free to all, free to some, or free to none?

Free to all.....1
Free to some.....2
Free to none.....3
Qualified.....4
No opinion.....5

19. Do you believe governments should set standards to ensure quality of day care for young children?

Yes.....1
No.....2
Qualified....3
No opinion...4

20. Does anyone in your household require support services, such as home care, visiting nurses, meals on wheels?

Yes.....1
No.....2
Qualified....3
No opinion...4

IF YES:

21. Are you satisfied with the quality and availability of these services?

Yes.....1
No.....2
Qualified....3
No opinion...4

22. Should governments put more money into transition homes and counselling services to help victims of family violence?

Yes.....1
No.....2
Qualified....3
No opinion...4

23. a) You have probably heard of such self-help or mutual aid groups as Alcoholics Anonymous, Bereaved Parents, and Parents Without Partners. Are you now participating in a self-help group?

Yes.....1
No.....2
Qualified....3
No opinion...4

23. b) Is a member of your household participating in a self-help group?

Yes.....1
No.....2
Qualified....3
No opinion...4

24. Do you think Canada should accept more or fewer immigrants than the 125,000 persons expected this year?

More.....1
Same.....2
Fewer.....3
Qualified....4
No opinion...5

25. What should be the first priority in our immigration policy: to reunite families, to provide asylum to political refugees, or to fill vacant jobs?

Families.....1
Asylum.....2
Jobs.....3
Qualified....4
No opinion...5

26. The Prime Minister and the provincial premiers recently reached an agreement on the Constitution at Meech Lake which may affect the future of social programs in Canada. Do you think our social programs will be better or worse as a result of the Meech Lake Accord?

Better.....1
Same.....2
Worse.....3
Qualified....4
No opinion...5

27. The federal finance minister has just proposed various tax reform measures. If these tax measures are brought in, will your financial situation be better, the same or worse?

Better.....1
Same.....2
Worse.....3
Qualified....4
No opinion...5

28. What do you consider to be the most important problem that Canadians face?

Unemployment...1	Pollution.....10	Unity.....19
Deficit.....2	Nuclear threat.11	AIDS.....20
Inflation.....3	Taxes.....12	Health.....21
Interest rates.4	Housing.....13	Family.....22
Economy.....5	Labour unrest..14	Morals.....23
Free Trade.....6	Education.....15	Low wages.....24
Fam Violence...7	Job security...16	Immigration...25
Poverty.....8	Pol leadership.17	Too few pop...26
regl disparity.9	No opinion.....18	Identify.....27
		Other.....28

Also code:
29.

Employment.....1
Income security.2
Social services.3
Health.....4
Housing.....5
Citizenship.....6
Justice.....7
Education.....8
Other.....9

To group you with other respondents across Canada, I would like to conclude this interview by asking a few questions about your household.

30. What is your marital status?

Married.....1
Common law/lvg together..2
Separated.....3
Divorced.....4
Widowed.....5
Single/never married.....6

31. In which age range are you? 18 to 24? 25 to 44? 45 to 64? or 65 plus?

18-24.....1
25-44.....2
45-64.....3
65+.....4
No answer....5

32. Are you male or female?

male....1 female....2 No answer...3

33. What level of education have you completed: Elementary School, Some High School, High School, Some Post-Secondary, or College or University?

Elementary.....1
Some High School..2
High School.....3
Some Post-Secondary..4
College/University...5
No answer.....6

34. How many children under 12 years of age are there in your household?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

35. How many people live in your household, including yourself?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

36. And finally, in which of the following ranges is your gross annual household income?

Under $10,000.....1	In the 50s.....6
10 to 20,000.....2	In the 60s.....7
In the 20s.....3	$70,000 or more...8
In the 30s.....4	No opinion.....9
In the 40s.....5	Don't know.....10

Thank you for answering these questions. The opinions of 1,000 Canadians will become public information in mid-August. Again, thank you. Goodbye.

37. [Code language of interview: English...1, French..21]

APPENDIX B

CCSD NATIONAL OPINION POLL, MARCH 1988

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

QUESTION # [R] = Repeat of June 1987 [N] = New in March 1988

(intro) THE FIRST QUESTION IN THIS NATIONAL OPINION POLL IS:

1. WHAT DO YOU CONSIDER TO BE THE MOST IMPORTANT PROBLEM THAT CANADIANS FACE? [R]

Code:

Unemployment...01	Nuclear threat..11	Health.....21
Deficit.....02	Taxes.....12	Family.....22
Inflation.....03	Housing.....13	Morals.....23
Interest rates.04	Labour unrest...14	Low wages.....24
Economy.....05	Education.....15	Immigration.....25
Free Trade.....06	Job Security....16	Too few pop.....26
Family violence07	Pol leadership..17	Identity.....27
Poverty.....08	No Opinion.....18	Other.....28
Regl disparity.09	Unity.....19	Abortion.....29
Pollution.....10	AIDS.....20	Day/Child care..30
		Language.....31

(intro) NOW I'M GOING TO ASK YOU SEVERAL QUESTIONS ABOUT EMPLOYMENT OR UNEMPLOYMENT:

2. DO YOU THINK GOVERNMENTS ARE DOING ENOUGH TO FIGHT UNEMPLOYMENT? [R]

Yes:1 Yes,but/if:2 Yes&No:3 No,but/if:4 No:5 NoOp:6 DA:7

3. DO YOU THINK GOVERNMENTS SHOULD GUARANTEE JOB TRAINING FOR PERSONS UNEMPLOYED FOR MORE THAN FOUR MONTHS? [R]

Yes:1 Yes,but/if:2 Yes&No:3 No,but/if:4 No:5 NoOp:6 DA:7

(intro) THIS IS A SLIGHTLY DIFFERENT QUESTION...

4. DO YOU THINK GOVERNMENTS SHOULD GUARANTEE A JOB FOR PERSONS UNEMPLOYED FOR MORE THAN FOUR MONTHS? [R]

Yes:1 Yes,but/if:2 Yes&No:3 No,but/if:4 No:5 NoOp:6 DA:7

5. SHOULD GOVERNMENTS PROVIDE WORK EXPERIENCE PROGRAMS FOR UNEMPLOYED YOUTH WHO HAVE NEVER HELD A JOB? [N]

Yes:1 Yes,but/if:2 Yes&No:3 No,but/if:4 No:5 NoOp:6 DA:7

6. WHAT IS THE BEST WAY TO CREATE JOBS? [N]

Code: Improve economy:01 Expand business/industry:02
More trade:03 Skills training:04 Other:05 NoOp:6 DA:7

7. FOR EMPLOYERS WHO CREATE NEW JOBS, ARE YOU IN FAVOUR OF GOVERNMENTS GIVING FULL, PARTIAL OR NO WAGE SUBSIDIES? [N]

None:1 Qual.Partial:2 Partial:3 Qual.Full:4 Full:5 NoOp:6 DA:7

8. DO YOU THINK NEW JOBS WILL BE CREATED BY NEW BUSINESS THROUGH LOWERING INTEREST RATES? [N]

Yes:1 Yes,but/if:2 Yes&No:3 No,but/if:4 No:5 NoOp:6 DA:7

9. FOR UNEMPLOYED PERSONS TO CREATE THEIR OWN JOBS, ARE YOU IN FAVOUR OF A LUMP SUM ADVANCE UNEMPLOYED INSURANCE PAYMENT? [N]

Yes:1 Yes,but/if:2 Yes&No:3 No,but/if:4 No:5 NoOp:6 DA:7

10. IN YOUR PROVINCE, THE MINIMUM WAGE IS $_____ PER HOUR. WHAT DO YOU BELIEVE SHOULD BE THE MINIMUM HOURLY WAGE? [N]

Code: exact figure (e.g., $4.50 = 4.50) NoOp:6 DA:7

11. DO YOU HAVE A PAID JOB? [R]

Yes:1 Yes,but/if:2 Yes&No:3 No,but/if:4 No:5 NoOp:6 DA:7

IF NO: GO TO 14
IF YES: CONTINUE

12: WHAT TYPE OF WORK DO YOU DO NOW? [N]

NoOp:6 DA:7

13. HOW MANY HOURS PER WEEK DO YOU USUALLY WORK IN YOUR PRESENT PAID JOB? [N]

Code: exact figure (e.g., 40 hours = 40) NoOp:6 DA:7

GO TO 17

****

IF NO:

14. ARE YOU ACTIVELY SEEKING WORK? [N]

Yes:1 Yes,but/if:2 Yes&No:3 No,but/if:4 No:5 NoOp:6 DA:7

15. WHAT TYPE OF WORK DID YOU DO IN YOUR LAST JOB? [N]

NoOp:6 DA:7

16. HOW MANY HOURS PER WEEK DID YOU USUALLY WORK IN YOUR LAST PAID JOB? [N]

Code: exact figure (e.g., 40 hours = 40) NoOp:6 DA:7

CONTINUE

****

17. IF YOU HAD A CHOICE, HOW MANY HOURS PER WEEK WOULD YOU PREFER TO WORK? [R]

Code: exact figure (e.g., 35 hours = 35) NoOp:6 DA:7

18. (if "fewer"): WOULD YOU BE WILLING TO TAKE A CUT IN PAY TO MATCH THE CUT IN HOURS? [R]

Yes:1 Yes,but/if:2 Yes&No:3 No,but/if:4 No:5 NoOp:6 DA:7

19. IF A FREE TRADE AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE USA AND CANADA IS REALIZED, WOULD YOUR JOB PROSPECTS IMPROVE, REMAIN THE SAME, OR WORSEN? [N]

Improve:2 Improve if:2 Remain the same:3 Worsen:4 Worsen if:5 NoOp:6 DA:7

20. DO YOU THINK THAT GOVERNMENTS SHOULD SUPPLEMENT THE WAGES OF THE WORKING POOR? [R]

Yes:1 Yes,but/if:2 Yes&No:3 No,but/if:4 No:5 NoOp:6 DA:7

21. WOULD YOU BE IN FAVOUR OF A SINGLE PROGRAM, NAMELY A GUARANTEED ANNUAL INFOME, THAT WOULD PUT ALL CANADIANS ABOVE THE POVERTY LINE? [R]

Yes:1 Yes,but/if:2 Yes&No:3 No,but/if:4 No:5 NoOp:6 DA:7

22. IN THE NEXT FIVE TO TEN YEARS, WILL YOU NEED TO INCREASE YOUR LEVEL OF SCHOOLING, OR IMPROVE YOUR WORK SKILLS?

Yes:1 Yes,but/if:2 Yes&No:3 No,but/if:4 No:5 NoOp:6 DA:7

23. PLEASE RATE ON A SCALE FROM 1 TO 10 -- WHERE 1 IS LOW AND 10 IS HIGH -- HOW IMPORTANT SCHOOLING & TRAINING, WORKING, PARENTING, AND VOLUNTEERING ARE TO YOU OVER YOUR LIFETIME:

HOW IMPORTANT IS SCHOOLING/TRAINING TO YOU ON A SCLAE FROM 1-10?

NoOp:11 DA:12 00-10

HOW IMPORTANT IS WORKING TO YOU ON A SCALE FROM 1 TO 10?

_____ _____

NoOp:11 DA:12 00-10

HOW IMPORTANT IS PARENTING TO YOU ON A SCALE FROM 1 TO 10?

_____ _____

NoOp:11 DA:12 00-10

HOW IMPORTANT IS VOLUNTEERING TO YOU ON A SCALE FROM 1 TO 10?

_____ _____

NoOp:11 DA:12 00-10

(intro) THE NEXT FEW QUESTIONS COVER A RANGE OF SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT TOPICS. WE WOULD LIKE YOUR OPINION ABOUT OLD AGE SECURITY.

24. OLD AGE SECURITY IS CURRENTLY AVAILABLE AT AGE 65. AT WHAT AGE DO YOU THINK FULL GOVERNMENT BENEFITS SHOULD BECOME AVAILABLE? [R]

_____

Less than 55:1 55-59:2 60-64:3 65:4 66+:5 NoOp:6 DA:7

25. ARE YOU OR A MEMBER OF YOUR HOUSEHOLD PARTICIPATING IN A SELF-HELP GROUP? [R]

_____

Yes:1 Yes,but/if:2 Yes&No:3 No,but/if:4 No:5 NoOp:6 DA:7

26. (<u>if "yes"</u>): WHAT IS THE NAME OF THE SELF-HELP GROUP? [N]

_____

NoOp:6 DA:7

(if unclear, ask: WHY DOES THE GROUP GET TOGETHER?)

27. DO YOU PERSONALLY KNOW AN ELDERLY PERSON WHO HAS BEEN PHYSICALLY OR EMOTIONALLY ABUSED? [N]

_____

Yes:1 Yes,but/if:2 Yes&No:3 No,but/if:4 No:5 NoOp:6 DA:7

28. THE POLICE ARE ENCOURAGED TO LAY A CHARGE OF ASSAULT AGAINST MEN WHO BATTER THEIR WIVES. DO YOU THINK THIS POLICY HAS HELPED BATTERED WOMEN? [N]

Yes:1 Yes,but/if:2 Yes&No:3 No,but/if:4 No:5 NoOp:6 DA:7

29. WOULD YOU SUPPORT THE INTRODUCTION OF A SMALL GROUP HOME FOR YOUNG OFFENDERS IN YOUR NEIGHBOURHOOD? [N]

Yes:1 Yes,but/if:2 Yes&No:3 No,but/if:4 No:5 NoOp:6 DA:7

30. (if "yes"): WHY? _____

31. (if "no"): WHY NOT? _____

32. AS AN ALTERNATIVE TO PRISON, WOULD YOU SUPPORT COMMUNITY-BASED PROGRAMS FOR OFFENDERS, OF ALL AGES, SUCH AS COUNSELLING SERVICES, OR COMPULSORY COMMUNITY SERVICES? [N]

Yes:1 Yes,but/if:2 Yes&No:3 No,but/if:4 No:5 NoOp:6 DA:7

33. IS THERE SOMEONE IN YOUR HOUSEHOLD WHO REQUIRES A HOME SUPPORT SERVICE AND IS NOT RECEIVING IT? [N]

Yes:1 Yes,but/if:2 Yes&No:3 No,but/if: No:5 NoOp:6 DA:7

34. (if "yes"): WHAT SERVICE IS NOT BEING RECEIVED?

_____

(intro) AND NOW A FEW QUESTIONS SO THAT WE CAN GROUP YOUR OPINIONS WITH OTHERS IN THE SAME SITUATION AS YOU.
YOUR ANSWERS WILL REMAIN CONFIDENTIAL.

35. WHAT IS YOUR MARITAL STATUS? [R]

Married:1 Commonlaw:2 Separated:3 Divorced:4 Widowed:5
Sgl/NMar:6 NoOp:7 DA:8

36. WHAT LEVEL OF EDUCATION HAVE YOU COMPLETED: ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, SOME HIGH SCHOOL, HIGH SCHOOL, SOME POST-SECONDARY SCHOOL, COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY? [R]

Elementary:1 Some HS:2 HS:3 Post-Sec:4 Coll/Univ:5
NoOp:6 DA:7

37. WERE YOU BORN IN OR OUTSIDE OF CANADA? [N]

In:1 Outside:2 NoOp:6 DA:7

38. HOW MANY PEOPLE LIVE IN YOUR HOUSEHOLD, INCLUDING YOURSELF? [R]

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9+

39. HOW MANY CHILDREN UNDER 12 YEARS OF AGE ARE THERE IN YOUR HOUSEHOLD? [R]

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9+

40. HOW MANY CHILDREN FROM 12 TO 17 YEARS OF AGE ARE THERE IN YOUR HOUSEHOLD? [N]

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9+

41. AND FINALLY, IS YOUR GROSS ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME UNDER OR OVER $30,000?

(if "under"): IS IT UNDER $10,000 10 TO 20,000 IN THE 20s
(if "over") : IS IT IN THE 30s IN THE 40s IN THE 50s
IN THE 60s IN THE 70s $80,000 OR MORE? [R]

-10:1 10-20:2 20s:3 30s:4 40s:5 50s:6
60s:7 70s:8 80s+:9 NoOp:10 DA:11

(ending) THANK YOU FOR TAKING THE TIME TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS OPINION POLL. YOUR COMMENTS ARE GREATLY APPRECIATED. GOODBYE/GOOD NIGHT.

The Canadian Council on Social Development

Membership Information

AS A MEMBER OF THE COUNCIL,

- you support work aimed at improving our social and economic environment;
- you participate in a network of people who share your social commitment;
- you are continuously informed of innovative ideas and major developments as they occur.

YOU ARE ENTITLED TO:

- **Perception**, our bilingual magazine on social development;
- Three quarterly national newsletters
  Overview, a review of social issues, trends and programs in Canada,
  Initiative, serving the self-help community;
  Vis-à-vis, exploring developments in the field of family violence;
- Preferential rates for participation in Council conferences and workshops;
- Information on new publications;
- The Council's annual report;
- Voting privileges at annual meetings;
- 20% off our regular prices for books and reports.

Membership Fees	
Individuals:	
• Students	$10
• Participating	$50
• Sustaining	$75
Organizations:	
Annual budget	
• less than $100,000	$ 75
• $100,001 to $300,000	$125
• over $300,000	$200
• Affiliate	$500
Libraries:	$50
Municipalities:	
• per 1,000 population (minimum fee $100	$2.50

To become a member, provide us with your name, the name of your organization (if applicable), complete address, membership category, and send along with your cheque to: CCSD Membership Services, 55 Parkdale Avenue, Ottawa, Ontario, K1Y 4G1. Telephone: (613) 728-1865.

The CCSD is a non-profit organization registered under the Tax Act relating to charities; tax receipts are issued for all donations and financial contributions.

Le Conseil canadien de Développement social

Les adhésions

EN TANT QUE MEMBRE DU CONSEIL,

- vous appuyez des efforts visant à améliorer notre contexte social et économique;
- vous faites partie d'un réseau de personnes partageant votre engagement social;
- vous êtes tenu(e) au courant des idées innovatrices et de l'actualité.

DE PLUS, VOUS RECEVEZ:

- **Perception**, notre revue bilingue de développement social;
- trois bulletins trimestriels nationaux
  Perspectives, qui examine les questions, tendances et programmes sociaux au Canada;
  Initiative, qui s'adresse aux réseaux d'entraide;
  Vis-à-vis, qui fait le point sur l'actualité en matière de violence familiale;
- des tarifs préférentiels lors de votre participation aux conférences et aux ateliers du Conseil;
- des renseignements sur les nouvelles publications;
- le rapport annuel du Conseil;
- le droit de vote à l'assemblée annuelle;
- 20% de réduction sur tous les livres et les rapports.

Catégories et frais d'adhésion	
Particuliers:	
• étudiant	10$
• membre	50$
• membre bienfaiteur	75$
Organismes:	
Budget annuel	
• moins de 100 000$	75$
• de 100 001 à 300 000$	125$
• plus de 300 000$	200$
• affiliés	500$
Bibliothèques:	50$
Municipalités:	
• par millier d'habitants (frais minimum 100$)	2.50$

Pour devenir membre, veuillez envoyer votre nom, celui de votre organisme (le cas échéant), votre adresse complète, la catégorie d'adhésion et votre chèque à l'adresse suivante: CCDS, Services aux membres, 55, avenue Parkdale, Ottawa (Ontario) K1Y 4G1. Téléphone: (613) 728-1865.

Le CCDS est un organisme à but non lucratif enregistré comme oeuvre de charité aux termes de la Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu. Les dons et les contributions financières feront l'objet de reçus aux fins d'impôt.